DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 034 HE 005 595

TITLE	The Administration of Universities. Summary Record of Working Party on University Administrative Systems, Paris, 5-8 October, 1966. Papers-8.
INSTITUTION	International Association of Universities, Paris (France).
PUB DATE	67
NOTE	108p.
AVAILABLE FROM	International Association of Universities, 6 Rue Franklin, Paris XVI, France ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; *Educational Administration; *Educational Responsibility; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Universities; *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS	France; Germany; Latin America; Soviet Union; *United Kingdom; United States

ABSTRACT

Three aspects of university administration are discussed: internal university structures and their interrelations, university responsibilities, and university relations with other institutions. Paper covering the university administrative systems of the United Kindgom, France, United States, Federal Republic of Germany, Latin American, and the Soviet Union are presented. (MJM)

ED 092034

International Association of Universities

PAPERS - 8

THE ADMINISTRATION OF UNIVERSITIES

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
International Association of Universities
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 005 595

PARIS 1967

THE ADMINISTRATION OF UNIVERSITIES

ED 092034

PAPERS
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

N° 8

THE ADMINISTRATION OF UNIVERSITIES

SUMMARY RECORD OF WORKING PARTY
ON
UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS
PARIS, 5-8 OCTOBER, 1966

6, rue Franklin, Paris XVI^e
1967

The French edition of this volume is published under the title:

L'Administration des Universités

The designations employed in this volume do not imply any expression of opinion on the part of the International Association of Universities concerning the legal status of any country, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitations of the frontiers of any country or territory.

© Copyright by the International Association of Universities, 1967.

PREFACE

Administration could be defined as the art of organizing co-operative human effort, and the allocation of resources for it, in order to attain common ends. Where the intellectual and material worlds meet, as they do in a university, it is through administration that the two are fused; and though for a long time it was fashionable in certain university circles to regard administration as a very secondary activity, its importance and the influence it can have on the most fundamental human tasks are now widely recognized.

As universities and society in general grow closer together, administration has a crucial part to play in strengthening the links which unite them. Higher education and research voraciously demanding more and more in the way of resources and in co-operative team work, depend on administration to such an extent that it has become an integral function of all university life. Not only does the efficiency of teacher and research-worker depend more and more on competent administration but administration has almost become a discipline in its own right.

It is therefore only to be expected that universities in most countries should be in process of re-examining their administrative systems. In developing countries, most of them have inherited a foreign system *en bloc*, conceived to answer needs and circumstances very different from their own; and new methods are needed in the so-called developed countries too, as development itself causes continual modification not only of the socio-economic conditions under which universities function, but also of the boundaries of knowledge and of the working conditions of research. However illustrious a university's inheritance may be it must constantly be appraised anew. Thus almost everywhere there is much re-thinking and re-shaping to be done, and experiments in other parts of the world can provide useful guide-lines for those seeking to bring about university reforms in their own countries.

The Administrative Board of the International Association of Universities had these facts in mind when it decided, at its annual meeting in 1966, to authorize the study reported upon in this volume. The subject is evidently an important one and had therefore to be approached with a

certain reserve. There are no two countries whose university structures are identical, and varying systems often exist within a single country. To try to establish an exhaustive and detailed encyclopaedia of every system in existence would involve great effort and resources and—given the present rhythm of university reform— would be out-of-date before it was completed. There could be no question of undertaking it, moreover, before its usefulness was clear, and the Board felt that it would therefore be best to begin by seeing what could be learned, at the practical level, from the comparison of some selected types of university organization.

Caution is obviously necessary in such comparisons and still more in forming any proposals for "cross-breeding". First of all, as was at once and repeatedly stressed by the participants in the study, every system is linked to its own social, political, legal and psychological context. It forms a relatively coherent entity; and it is by no means certain, if one of its elements were to be transplanted into a different institutional setting, that it would continue to function as before. It must also be remembered that some people tend to admire systems simply because they are different from the ones they know. They have no direct experience of the constraints and limitations involved in them. But any worthwhile evaluation must take account of disadvantages as well as advantages. Every institution, however well conceived, has inevitable defects—social, educational or scholarly. These may be difficult to assess, but to disregard them is dangerous. For valid comparisons to be made, exchange of experience is needed between academic people who can speak with authority of the full operational scope of their own university administrative systems. This method was therefore chosen by the Administrative Board of the IAU in inviting six consultants to prepare reports on the administrative systems familiar to them and later to meet as a working party in Paris at which they could discuss their experience and varying points of view. The systems chosen were: the American, presented by Mr. R.A. Holden, Secretary of Yale University; the British, presented by Professor W.H.G. Armytage, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Sheffield; the French, presented by Rector H. Gauthier, Deputy Rector, University of Paris; the West German, presented by Professor R. Reinhardt, Director, Institute of Economic and Commercial Law, University of Marburg; the Latin-American, presented by Professor Gilda L. de Romero Brest, former Director, Institute of Education, University of Buenos Aires, and the Soviet-Russian, presented by Professor I.T. Shvets, Rector, University of Kiev.

These six systems were chosen because of their range and importance. In many ways they have inspired variants in a large number of countries, though it is evident that they do not fully cover the extraordinary diversification of university structures throughout the world. No claim to do this is made —the gaps are obvious, especially with regard to Asia. The aim pursued was that of opening up discussion and taking some measure of the usefulness of a colloquium in dealing with so complex a field. In publishing the reports prepared as personal contributions by the consultants, together with a record of their discussions for which the IAU secretariat, with their consent, is responsible, the International Association of Universities does not pretend that it is providing a comprehensive account of the administration of universities—even in the countries specifically referred to. It simply believes that it is making a modest contribution to a debate becoming more and more urgent throughout the world, and one in which it hopes to continue to take part.

* * *

I am glad to have this opportunity of thanking the consultants who co-operated in the study, as well as Dr. Dafaalla, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Khartoum, who first broached the idea to the IAU Administrative Board and who took the chair during the greater part of their meeting. They all gave proof of the value of such discussions, when held between competent people. In deciding that the present volume should be published, the Administrative Board has confirmed this view.

Constantine K. Zurayk,
President,
International Association of Universities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE — Constantine K. ZURAYK v

INTRODUCTORY NOTE xi

SUMMARY RECORD OF WORKING PARTY

I Internal University Structures and their Inter-Relations 3

II University Responsibilities 19

III University Relations with Other Institutions 25

PAPERS ON UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE - United Kingdom 35

H. GAUTHIER - France 49

R. A. HOLDEN - U.S.A. 55

R. REINHARDT - Federal Republic of Germany 67

G. L. DE ROMERO BREST - Latin America 85

I. T. SHVETS - U.S.S.R. 93

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The working party met at Unesco House, Paris, from 5-8 October, 1966 and Dr. C.K. Zurayk, President of the IAU, and Dr. El Nazeer Dafaalla, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Khartoum, took part in it with the consultants (though M. Gauthier was unable to be present for all the sessions). Dr. Dafaalla, who was chiefly responsible for proposing the study, had drawn the attention of his fellow members of the IAU Administrative Board to its potential value for African universities, anxious to reform their structures and to become better equipped to meet the requirements of their national situations. Dr. Zurayk presided at the opening session during which it was agreed to invite Dr. Dafaalla to take the chair for the remainder of the meeting. Mr. H.M.R. Keyes, Secretary-General of the Association, also participated, together with Mr. D.J. Aitken and M.G. Daillant of the Secretariat. Professor K. Rybnikov, Director of the Division of Higher Education, Unesco, was present for part of the discussions, at the invitation of the colloquium.

It was agreed at the beginning of the meeting that the IAU Secretariat should make a draft report of the proceedings and submit it to the consultants for comment. It was also agreed that the report should not take the form of a chronological and detailed account of the successive interventions but seek to present the general structure and principal elements of the discussion and record the conclusions which emerged. These conclusions, as will be seen later in the report, were not always unanimous nor could they be translated into simple formulae guaranteed to produce an ideal university administrative system.

Such a result would, of course, have been astonishing to the participants themselves. What university people are seeking is not an abstract set of rules, but, in the words of Dr. Dafaalla, an account of the "implications and, possibly, the complications" of the different administrative systems at present in use. Those responsible for university administration can then make their own choices, adaptations and combinations according to the needs and priorities of particular situations.

From the beginning, the participants were all agreed about one thing: the pitfall to be avoided was that of trying to create an 'ideal' university, a university working perfectly where tension, friction and conflict had no place—an 'entropic' university, to use the term employed by Professor Armytage. On the contrary, what was important was to create a 'dialectical' university, one in which the most divergent theses and antitheses might be freely confronted and synthesized.

The words of Paul Valéry were recalled: "two dangers constantly threaten the world: order and disorder." They seemed more applicable to universities than to any other kinds of institution, and only by accepting a compromise between the two dangers (a compromise which must continually be revised and renewed) could universities hope to remain alive and effective. The notion of "perfection" could not be applied to university administration.

The situation might be different in a small institution of higher education devoted to a precise and limited programme of training, but the working party agreed to concentrate its attention on universities in the full sense of the word—their distinctive feature being that they are institutions sufficiently differentiated and having an adequate "critical mass" to make dialectics, tension and dialogue possible within them. Short of certain dimensions, an institution, whatever its name, should be considered too small to be really a university.

The working party agreed not to discuss the "mission" of universities —a subject already dealt with at length in other contexts—but simply to take for granted that they had obligations, on the one hand to knowledge and culture and on the other, to society, the human resources of nations, the international community and, in many cases, specifically to governments. According to their particular circumstances, universities might be led to place special emphasis on one task or another, but neither the spirit of research—even if this was not expressed in ambitious programmes—nor the spirit of public service ought to be wholly absent from them. It was stressed that interchanges with society around them were not only important for reasons of university ethics or deontology, but were necessary for the health and vitality of the university itself, which, if it lived in isolation, might intellectually wither away. Universities could, in a sense, be compared to cells possessing their own life and structure whilst being parts of other organisms without which they could not hope to survive. A study of university administration implied not merely a study of internal university systems and their functioning, but of the relations linking them to society in general. It would be arbitrary to consider these separately, since they conditioned each other. Moreover, functions which are carried out in some cases by the university internally, in others are assumed by external bodies, ministerial or other. And some systems have bodies which are neither completely internal nor completely external. This is the case with the "lay" administrative boards of American universities, the curatorial system in some German universities and, up to a point, some of the bodies functioning under the ministry of education in France. In the first two cases, the composition of the bodies was external to the university but the bodies themselves were, in varying degrees, incorporated within it, representing society in general, or the State; in the third case, on the contrary, the bodies, although academic in composition (mainly professors elected their peers), were not attached to particular universities but had functions affecting the internal life of all universities in the country (for

example, in the matter of appointments). It would be difficult to determine in which of these situations the "internal" link with the university is the strongest, but no classification of administrative problems can be entirely satisfactory, since their very nature implies that they are constantly interacting one on the other.

To facilitate the presentation of this report an attempt has been made to consider first the internal structures of the university and then the relations it has with the outside world through its administrative and financial bodies, which are often mixed in composition. This involves proceeding by order of decreasing internal links or increasing external relations, and abandoning to a certain extent the outline originally proposed to the consultants. In fact, their meeting demonstrated that while this may have been well suited to a unilateral presentation it did not necessarily lend itself to a multilateral discussion. It would have been possible to begin, not with the *systems themselves* but with their *functions* (curricula, examinations, research, etc.) and to consider subsequently the means by which they are carried out. This approach would have been similar to the one adopted by Sir Hector Hetherington in his examination for the IAU of the five main issues of university autonomy*. But using this method a second time might have produced a report too similar to one already published by the Association. It seemed preferable to make a new approach.

The functional point of view, however, is not completely left aside in the report. After a description of internal university structures, an attempt is made to look at their operation in the main areas of university activity. The principal functions of the university all have some relation to society as a whole and the involvement of extra-university agencies is indispensable for their full accomplishment. This examination of the university at work thus provides a point of transition between the study of its internal structures and the study of its relations with the outside world.

---

* See, *University Autonomy, its meaning today*, International Association of Universities, Paris, 1965.

SUMMARY RECORD OF WORKING PARTY

1/2

I

INTERNAL UNIVERSITY STRUCTURES AND THEIR INTER-RELATIONS

A) *Academic staff systems*

One of the basic elements of a university is obviously its academic staff. The hierarchical structure varies from country to country, indeed from university to university, but the general pattern has certain features common to all university systems. Detailed descriptions of some of these hierarchies are given in the consultan's' reports. The working party did not consider it useful to discuss the variants, or to try to determine, for instance, whether it was preferable to envisage an academic career as having four, five or six successive grades, or whether parallel hierarchies were desirable. It chose rather to concentrate on problems of *recruitment*, for which the various systems have found very different solutions.

If some order, even of an arbitrary kind, is to be introduced into the diversities revealed in this question, two dividing lines can be drawn, and two classifications can be based upon them.

On the one hand a distinction can be made between systems under which appointments are made exclusively by university bodies and those under which ministerial intervention is required; on the other hand a distinction can be made between systems which provide permanent tenure above a given rank and those under which all appointments are subject to periodic review.

1. *Appointments—by University Bodies or by a Ministry.*

In two of the six systems represented at the meeting, the French and West German, a minister is involved in academic staff appointments, at least to the higher grades. The problem of relations between the university and the "external world" is thus present in these systems from the level of recruitment. Since the recruitment of its academic staff might well seem to be a highly internal, academic responsibility for a university, some members of the working party raised questions and expressed hesitations with regard to such systems of ministerial appointment*.

In consequence, a brief review was made of the French system of making appointments to chairs (the appointment of lecturers follows a nearly identical pattern). When a chair in a French university falls vacant, the

* Systems which do not involved ministerial intervention are described in the papers on Latin America, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

vacany is formally declared by the appropriate faculty council, and announced in the official press. Any holder of a state doctorate who is enrolled on the official list of those declared apt to hold posts in higher education, established by the Consultative Committee to the Minister of Education, may submit his candidature (at least in the faculties of letters and science). The Committee, which is composed of professors representing all disciplines, a majority of whom are elected by their colleagues, proceeds by vote to make an initial selection; this usually includes at least two names. A second selection is then made by the particular faculty council concerned. The names of the candidates thus proposed are submitted to the Minister of Education, who makes the appointment. The proposals of the Consultative Committee and of the faculty council are not always the same, since the former bases its judgment on purely academic criteria, whilst the latter may also take account of the candidate's ability to to fit himself into the faculty concerned. But, on the whole, the system operates satisfactorily and in the overwhelming majority of instances the Minister follows the advice that he is given.

There is a slight variation in this procedure when new chairs are created, because certain conditions have to be met—the existence of an appropriate laboratory, for example. The faculty submits its recommendations to the Minister and the Consultative Committee is consulted, but the number of candidates is usually smaller than in the case of a vacancy in an established chair.

For the recruitment of professorial staff for faculties of law and medicine, a national competitive examination, the 'agrégation', is organized. The most successful candidates are usually able to choose the posts they prefer.

The main danger in a system of ministerial appointments, some of the consultants thought, is that, representing a political authority, the Minister may tend to discriminate for political or ideological reasons against academic candidates whose opinions do not coincide with those of the government. In France, however, this potential danger is hardly ever a real one. Only very exceptionally, in periods of grave national crisis, have temporary suspensions been known, but political discrimination is usually non-existent. If it did occur, it would encounter vigorous opposition from the entire academic body. The traditional prerogatives and freedoms of universities are strongly upheld in France and a French professor is entirely his own master in matters of teaching. Nor does he hesitate to criticize in public the Minister who has appointed him. It was also pointed out that in France a professor is a civil servant, which makes it technically necessary for the Minister of Education to be involved in his appointment. Nomination by a Minister also lends a national significance to these appointments and in many ways strengthens the security of the professorial career.

Perhaps more troublesome than this ministerial participation is the stringent requirement of a state doctorate. This is nevertheless tempered by the institution of "associate professorships" with limited terms of appointment and no stipulations with regard to academic degrees or nationality. Use of this form of appointment is perhaps not sufficiently widespread, although measures to extend it are now planned.

In Federal Germany, a professor is also a civil servant, and is appointed by the responsible Minister (the Minister of the *Land* in which the university is situated) on the recommendation of the faculty concerned. In a general way the French requirement of a doctorate and enrolment on the

aptitude list finds its counterpart in the *Habilitation* which confers the academic *venia legendi* and virtually corresponds to a higher doctorate. Obtaining the *Habilitation* does not also make the Privatdozent a civil servant. As a rule, however, he is given such an appointment in a university (e.g. as Diaetendozent). The increase in the number of chairs, moreover, nowadays makes it possible for Privatdozenten to obtain rapid promotion to professorships.

Professor Reinhardt's report gives a detailed description of the procedures in force, and, in particular, of the new provisions of the Hessian Law which endows the Minister with the right to appoint an 'appropriately qualified person' if the faculty has failed to formulate its recommendations within six months of a chair falling vacant. If the Minister objects to the nomination made by the faculty, he may invite others, but must give specific reasons for his objections. This rarely occurs.

In summary, it may be said that ministerial appointments in both the French and West German systems do not produce the abuses which might be feared by those accustomed to other systems. In both cases all the Minister usually does is to ratify a choice made by members of the university—though not by the university as such. In France, neither the University Council nor the Rector takes part in appointments (to the higher ranks of the academic hierarchy) and the Dean is involved only insofar as he is chairman of the faculty council. In Federal Germany, also, only the faculty concerned is responsible for making the initial selection, even though it may occasionally take the advice of other faculties (for example, the faculty of medicine may consult the faculty of science) and, in some instances, may submit its recommendations to the University Senate. In both cases, therefore, the system confers extensive decision-making powers on the faculties as opposed to the central organs of the university. Perhaps there is a risk here.

Finally, both countries concerned have very old university traditions, and—a factor that should not be overlooked—the prerogatives of civil servants and the special privileges of academic staff are better elaborated and are doubtless more of a protection, than in many other countries. Would such a system function satisfactorily in countries with different legal, political and social characteristics? It would be dangerous to reply to such a question. The working party, in any case, did not set out to take up a position for or against ministerial appointments. Those participants with firsthand knowledge of the system did not dispute its basic principles or actual functioning. The others simply indicated their lack of enthusiasm for its introduction in their own countries.

2. *Tenure—Permanent or by Re-Appointment.*

Among the systems represented at the meeting, there were again two which differ from the others in that no appointment, even for the highest academic posts, is permanent, and that the different patterns of permanency of tenure practised elsewhere are unknown to them. These are the Soviet-Russian and Latin-American systems. In both cases, the process of recruitment is based on every post being re-opened and filled by competitive appointment at periodic intervals. These are of five years in the Soviet Union and vary from three to ten years in Latin-America. Details of the procedures in force may be found in the reports concerned. In the Soviet Union, the head of the faculty council is responsible for selection, following a preliminary examination by the council committee, but the

nomination must be ratified by the Rector. In Latin-America, the university appoints a jury of eminent scholars who may be drawn from other universities in the country or even from abroad. The jury submits a report to the faculty council which makes a nomination and this, in turn, is submitted to the university council which usually accepts the nomination, but may request that competitive selection be re-opened. This is based on a review of the candidate's work and he may also be required to give a trial lecture or take a written or oral test. A university degree is usually required, but there are exceptions.

In both systems, titular academic staff may of course offer themselves as candidates for re-appointment and be confirmed in their posts, but they may also be passed over for other candidates.

In Latin America, this method of recruitment has been one of the important aspects of the 'university reform' movement (It applies only to state universities). Clearly it prevents the formation of those scholarly 'feudalities' or 'satrapies' that are often condemned, rightly or wrongly. Some professors tend to consider themselves the sole trustees of the field of knowledge to which they are 'assigned', and which they may or may not foster or advance. In the Soviet Union, the system is considered stimulating: it makes it impossible for a professor to rest on his laurels, and regularly offers opportunities of promotion to the most talented young scholars. Moreover, it must be added that, in the Soviet Union, academic staff enjoy protection and, in particular, protection of their own union, against decisions they consider arbitrary. Though it may not always be very easy to "sack" a professor, the mere existence of periodical competitive re-appointment induces those who are already 'placed', and those who are seeking appointment, to work harder and to show their powers of initiative.

But however valid these arguments might seem, they did not convert those of the participants who were accustomed to the system of permanency of tenure. They acknowledged, of course, that permanency presents certain disadvantages. Apart from exceptional cases (serious illness, action taken by a disciplinary council) it makes it almost impossible for a university to rid itself of members of staff whose academic performance for one reason or other has become questionable, or even close to zero. The only way out in some cases, as one of the participants remarked, was to arrange for their 'promotion'. However, such cases are relatively rare, because of the intellectual rivalry prevalent in universities, which encourages scholars to "produce". They seem to constitute a lesser evil compared with the lack of security and independence which would follow the abolition of permanency of tenure. Governments, and private fund-providers, would have greater chances of exerting political and other types of pressure, and the system of periodical competitive re-appointment could, at times, offer easy ways of pursuing personal vendettas or paying off old scores between colleagues, even though the integrity of academic people generally might be relied upon to avoid the worst abuses.

The working party came to no unanimous conclusion on this matter. So much depends, it felt, on the traditions, customs and psychological climate of each country.

This is also true to some extent of the advertising of vacant academic posts. The American system avoids this procedure as it is thought better in the United States to approach the best candidates directly rather than to leave the initiative to them. There is reason to believe that the best

people are reluctant to come forward as candidates and thus appear to be asking for advancement. American universities prefer, therefore, to explore the field themselves, inviting the views of highly-qualified people from other universities, in the ways described by Mr. Holden in his report, and then to negotiate directly with those whose appointment they would welcome. In this way there is lively competition between universities to recruit the best teachers or research workers, and they try to attract first-class staff by making the most tempting offers they can.

This kind of rivalry is not possible in a country like France, where academic staff, as civil servants, are paid in accordance with official salary scales. Large variations of salary would have a bad psychological reception. The present system based on the public advertisement of vacancies is in line with the strong attachment to formal equality of opportunity, expressed in major national competitive examinations like the 'agrégation'.

Even though it may advertise vacancies, a university or faculty is not prevented from approaching those whose collaboration it would welcome and inviting them to come forward as candidates. This element of "advertising" is of course inherent in all public competitive examinations. In the United Kingdom the system has even greater flexibility; advertising is as often as not the method employed, but universities also reserve the right to invite the candidature of persons who have not applied. Generally speaking the British system is extremely flexible, and in Professor Armytage's view it would be more accurate to refer to the British 'lack of system'. Faced with a shortage of academic staff—a situation that is not limited to the United Kingdom—universities try to get who best they can as best they can. Academic degrees, particularly the doctorate have hardly any influence on the choice of candidate. The practices of individual universities offer a wide range of procedures, even for professorial appointments. Sometimes the senate is invited to participate and sometimes a small committee (of about six members) has full discretion to take a decision with the Vice-Chancellor, after consulting anyone it may wish to outside the university. For the lower ranks of the hierarchy, methods again vary: when an assistant lecturer is to be appointed, the professor generally has considerable authority and acts on his own initiative, with the Dean's agreement. Further up in the hierarchy, where posts are permanent, the faculty more often than not participates in the appointment. It is also necessary to have the finance committee's agreement as to what salary can be offered.

In all systems, appointments to the lower ranks of the academic hierarchy are made with greater flexibility or require fewer formalities.

Even in the USSR, where selection is as a rule on a competitive basis for all appointments, the Ministry may suggest the appointment of a teacher *(prepodavatel)* for a limited term, without following the selective recruitment procedure (see Professor Shvets' report). In France, the individual professor chooses his assistants, although his choice must be ratified by the Dean and by the Rector, who then makes the appointment.

In the United States, where professors are not always holders of chairs, all members of the academic staff of a department may participate in the nomination of an instructor, whereas for higher posts only the professors or faculty members on tenure are usually required to agree to a candidate's name before submitting it to the university's higher administrative authorities.

It can be seen that there are a great number of methods, procedures or

practices for academic appointments, often deeply rooted in their particular systems and in the various attitudes of mind which condition their functioning. Does this imply that little can be done other than to record this multiplicity, and that any attempt to define guide lines which could be adapted to the different systems should be abandoned? The discussions of the working party showed the contrary to be true, and that it is possible to draw some cautiously formulated conclusions from its exchange of views.

I.—As far as recruitment to the lower grades of the academic hierarchy is concerned, it is usual and normal—though a few exceptions exist—for selection to be decentralized and to be largely the responsibility of a department, or a holder of a chair, or sometimes a faculty, but not of the university itself. A professor or the members of a department seem the most favourably placed to select their own assistants or young colleagues, both from a strictly academic point of view and from considerations of psychology or character. Temperamental incompatibility between superior and subordinate would certainly have a disturbing influence on a working relationship. Nonetheless, the dangers of this system must be appreciated. A professor may well choose the most amenable and not necessarily the most brilliant assistant, and a department may reject the most intellectually enterprising candidate in favour of one more compatible with its own outlook and habits. Excessive in-breeding and what Professor Armytage called the regular practice of intellectual 'incest' put academic recruitment in danger of sterility. It is difficult to suggest a remedy for this, but it seems certain that isolation and 'cliquishness' on the part of chairs and departments can only aggravate it. And what applies to initial recruitment, applies also to promotion.

II.—With regard to appointments to higher posts, it is usual—except in systems based on ministerial appointments—for the central university authorities, as well as the department or faculty concerned, to take part in the choice of candidates or at least be called upon to ratify and sanction nominations. Once again, if too close in-breeding is considered undesirable and if it is feared that this will be favoured by co-option practised by too restricted a group, the participation of the university as such must be considered opportune. This stresses the unity of the institution and is a way of checking the inward-looking tendencies of its component parts. It remains to be seen, however, in systems where faculties traditionally enjoy a very great measure of autonomy, whether the sanction of the Rector or the University Council, together with that of the Minister, would be anything more than a formality. It seems clear, in any case, that it could only take on its full significance if accompanied by other measures tending to emphasise the existence of the university as against that of its faculties (as many belonging to such systems would wish).

III.—Generally speaking, it seems that the organization of the academic profession would benefit in some instances by being made more flexible and in others, by receiving a more definite structure. In systems where degree requirements have an important role to play in the selection or promotion of academic staff, it would be as well to ensure—and make ample use of—recruitment of persons who have proved their scholarship in other ways than by the preparation of a thesis or two.

In some systems where the academic profession is not incorporated in the civil service, a degree of formal organization would seem desirable. Academic staff associations can play a useful role in this, especially in relation to questions of salary, pensions, etc. But universities themselves, particularly in countries, such as the United Kingdom, where they traditionally enjoy the greatest measure of autonomy, are becoming increasingly aware of the need for some co-ordination in the fields of research and teaching. Everything can no longer be done everywhere, and special centres must therefore be planned rationally. This requires co-ordination of policy in matters of staffing and an amicable and logical distribution of financial resources as well as of available talent. The working party had no time to study in detail the extent to which policies of appointment and recruitment were influenced by national or international inter-university co-operation, but the question is perhaps one deserving consideration at some future time.

B) *Systems of teaching and research and their structures.*

In examining the procedures for the recruitment of academic staff, the group was naturally led to consider the structures within which the members of staff work and which have a direct bearing on their selection and appointment.

1. *Subdivisions of the University.*

Broadly speaking, it is possible to make a distinction between the systems in which the basic structure is the faculty (West Germany, France and, to a large extent, Latin-America) and systems in which the basic element is the department (the United States). Two systems operate between these extremes: the British, which in most instances conserves the faculties whilst allowing considerable leeway to the departments, and the Soviet, which is also based on the system of faculties, but where these are of rather modern conception and exist in larger numbers than in the traditional systems of Western Europe. They are divided into units, which in spite of being called 'chairs', bear a resemblance to departments in the sense that several teachers are grouped around the director of the chair. On the other hand, the rectorate and the central university council in the USSR have more extensive powers than is normally the case in systems which centre on the faculty (West Germany and France).

In recent times there has been much discussion about the respective merits and defects of faculties and departments. The faculty is made up of a greater number of disciplines, but these are determined as a result of a rigid division that does not always follow the development of knowledge and more serious still, the dividing lines between faculties often separate them into water-tight compartments. The structure of the faculty is too heavy and does not lend itself to an easy flow of communication. Furthermore the faculty as a unit runs the risk, from the point of view of its internal life, of disintegrating into a plurality of chairs, each occupied by an 'all-powerful' professor who is in no way obliged to enter into very close collaboration with his colleagues in other chairs. This process has been examined on many occasions and the working party did not investigate it at any length.

It should not be supposed, however—as is perhaps too easily done by

some academics who come up against the walls raised by the faculty system in carrying out their every-day work—that division into departments is in itself a universal solution. In fact, departments may also tend to separate themselves off, and the isolated branch of knowledge is then still smaller than in the case of the faculties. A department may also have an 'all-powerful' director who may sterilize the work of his younger colleagues. "Departmentalization of knowledge" is the comment occasionally made about systems based on the department, and this is synonymous with partitioning and disintegration. Clearly there are arguments on both sides, and this is probably why the working party chose to remain neutral on the issue.

However, it did reach agreement on a number of principles which were considered to be almost universally valid.

The first may seem to be a statement of the obvious. It is so often proclaimed but so rarely given practical expression that there can be no harm in repeating that it is important for universities to design structures that do not almost inevitably involve a process of "sectionalization" of the life of the intellect. One way of avoiding this, or at least of minimizing its ill-effects, is to abolish "proprietors" or at any rate the life-long and exclusive right of "ownership". In other words, in the departmental system it is desirable to have a periodical change of head or director, based on a policy of rotation or election, so that terms of office are limited and not renewable indefinitely. Many British universities are in process of transferring to this system of rotation, on the American model. Apart from advantages which increase the vitality of the department, the system has the merit—for its individual members—of condemning no-one to a life-sentence of administrative work and the consequent danger of stagnation.

It also seems advisable—to prevent sclerosis—to entrust the direction of departments to members of the academic staff who are not titular professors, as is the practice in the United States. In the universities of some developing countries, professors are often foreigners, and staff members of the country may be appropriately appointed as departmental heads, even though they are of subordinate rank. The expatriate professor can then assume the very useful role of adviser.

Similarly, in the case of faculties, the working party thought that the dean's mandate should be of limited duration—though his period of office should be sufficiently long to allow for necessary continuity in the administrative structure. The working party also thought that the strengthening of the central university authorities might constitute an effective buffer against the splintering tendencies of faculties.

Where faculties and departments exist side by side the presence of the one naturally modifies the influence of the other and, moreover, the question of relationships between departmental heads and the dean arises. In the United Kingdom, for example, persuasion is often a dean's principal means of action, and departmental heads have the right to oppose faculty decisions in the central senate. They may also go directly to the vice-chancellor, over the dean's head. Clearly, actions of this sort can be effective only if the central university authorities have real powers, and if vital decisions are not all taken at faculty level.

There is, however, a dual difficulty for which neither the departmental system nor the faculty system provides an effective remedy. It is not impossible for the same subjects to be taught several times within different departments or faculties, where as certain new borderline or inter-disci-

plinary subjects may not be taught at all. In Latin-America, in order to avoid expensive duplication in teaching, some universities have created what they call "departments" (though the term here has a different sense from the usual one) which are responsible for groups of related subjects common to several faculties or curricular programmes. Other universities (for example, in West Germany) have set up inter-disciplinary or inter-faculty institutes.

The working party listened with much interest to a brief report on an experiment being made in some of the new United Kingdom universities. These, believing that faculties are too big and departments too small, are trying to set up much more flexible intermediate units called "schools". Under this novel scheme a school of social science may include history or psychology. As need arises, its academic content can be redefined and experiments made with new combinations of subjects. This flexible framework is particularly useful for research and postgraduate students, and should be more stimulating than the narrow confines of departments.

The working party felt that this experiment in the British universities merited careful attention. Clearly it was too early to try to estimate its practical efficiency but it appeared to offer a promising solution to a fundamental university problem—that of organizing working arrangements between various disciplines and groups of disciplines without fixing them in excessively rigid patterns, which always become very difficult to dismantle or remodel because of the inertia inherent in all institutionalization.

This tendency to widen the range of departments is also found in the United States (for example, at the University of California) though it is not yet very widespread. Departments which have been widened or remodelled in this way are there called "divisions" and not "schools". It is also important to note that the American post-graduate schools offer a much wider framework of study than departments. Post-graduate schools are a creation of the American university system and may not be easily transplanted to other systems, but the working party believed that with the growing numbers of research students it was desirable to create comprehensive structures for advanced studies. The mere supervision of a thesis, and this sporadically and from a distance, was no longer satisfactory, even if still necessary, and frequently meant that an advanced student worked most of his time in isolation, with only limited guidance from a single professor. It was noted that the Soviet system of "candidature" provided another way of re-arranging advanced study, and provided both teaching and the supervision of research.

The working party looked at another related question, though it was unable to examine it in detail. This was the problem of whether research structures should normally be similar to teaching structures (chairs, departments, etc.). In West Germany, for example, basic research work is carried out in institutes which are quite separate from chairs, even though there is a close link between them at the personal level, since the holder of a chair may also be director of an institute. In the same way in Latin-America, research is carried out in institutes distinct from departments and faculties, but between which there may be exchanges of students for varying periods of time. The working party felt that a future study might try to establish to what extent teaching and research need different forms of collaboration and different working structures and particularly whether there were cases in which dual structures seemed necessary.

The working party did not specially examine the question of councils

which, with the dean, guide or direct the life of the faculty but these, in practice, are similar in many ways to those of central university councils or boards which are dealt with below.

2. *Central University Authorities.*

In all the systems considered, the activities of the different university divisions are co-ordinated and directed centrally, though the arrangements for this vary greatly. There is an academic head and most frequently an assembly of members of the university (senate, council, etc.). But though they are central to the university, these bodies usually also provide a meeting point between it and the "outside world". In many cases the head of a university is chosen by non-academic authorities. Academic boards are sometimes duplicated or even replaced by lay bodies which may have very wide powers.

a) *University Councils.*

Most universities have a central council or senate elected by their academic members. The only exception to this in the systems represented at the working party is to be found in the United States, where not every university has a "senate". As is shown in Mr. Holden's report, however, this is the result of a kind of historical accident. Harvard University originally intended to have a structure similar to those of Oxford and Cambridge, one through which it would be governed exclusively by members of the university or collegiate community. It was only because the academic body lacked the necessary time and resources that a lay administrative board was set up; that is to say a board composed of non-academic personalities. This system later became widespread, but it should be remembered that these lay boards (which are examined separately later in this document) generally try not to intervene in specifically university matters like teaching and research, even though they are nominally empowered to do so, and usually are content to ratify decisions about appointments and curricula. In the United Kingdom, at universities other than Oxford and Cambridge, there is usually both a university senate and a council partly composed of lay members. In France, the university council includes a number of non-academic members. In five Latin American countries university councils include the Minister of Education or his representative, but in most countries of the region the public authorities are not represented on the councils. In the Soviet Union and West Germany, the university council and senate (full or restricted) are made up exclusively of members of the university. At least in matters of teaching and research—as opposed to those concerning finance and administration—it is, as a general rule, a purely university body which exercices power, influence and control over the university's activities, although the extent of the authority of such bodies varies considerably. The working party had no precise recommendations to make about the composition of these bodies, circumstances vary too greatly for it to be possible, for example, to prescribe ideal proportions of professors and other members of academic staff. But, even though it had no specific quantitative recommendation to make, the working party stressed that there should be adequate representation of all levels of the academic staff so that a true university dialectic should be possible and that the university should not be controlled by an oligarchy of dignitaries. The same principle was valid *mutatis mutandis* for faculty boards.

The working party gave lengthy consideration to the question of student representation on these university and or faculty bodies. Opinions remained divided, but two fairly clear points of view emerged from the discussions, a majority one and a minority one.

The majority view largely corresponded with that expressed by Sir Hector Hetherington in his paper on 'University Autonomy'*. It may be summarized as follows:

i) Generally speaking, students should not be considered merely as the recipients of instruction, but as individuals gifted with powers of independent decision and initiative.

ii) These powers should be able to reveal and express themselves in the management of institutions and organizations which are usually called, "student activities"—restaurants, university residences, sporting activities, student aid, artistic and cultural societies—though this should not imply that students are uninterested in other questions.

iii) In the specifically university sphere and particularly that of studies, students should be able to make their point of view known and have an assurance that it is taken into consideration, even if not followed. It is psychologically important for the student to be treated as a responsible individual, and it is very helpful to the teacher to know the reactions of those who are taught.

iv) But, nevertheless, students have neither the maturity nor the competence needed for full participation in important decisions affecting curricula, examinations or appointments. In certain countries (in the United States and the United Kingdom, for example) they apparently do not wish to be concerned with these decisions, and it is often difficult to find capable student leaders who are willing to sacrifice something of their own studies in order to represent the collective interests of their fellows. In contrast, there are other countries where students are most anxious to take part in university administration, but their motives are often suspect. There is reason to believe that they seek more or less deliberately to lower academic standards or that still very impressionable, they become consciously or not the instruments of political parties, pressure groups and so on. Even when it may be supposed that their motives are sincere and their goodwill certain, they are not properly equipped to judge, for example, the qualifications of a university teacher.

In short, this view suggests that, although it may be useful to give more or less symbolic representation to students in academic councils, their role should be carefully defined and should be only a consultative one. They should be excluded from discussions on matters such as examinations or appointments (see the report of Professor Reinhardt). It may, however, be very useful to set up liaison structures between students and the teaching staff—some British universities, for example, have mixed senate-student committees. These have no executive powers but any question affecting university life may be brought up and discussed at their meetings.

The minority view, in contrast, held that the full and complete participation of students in university councils is both legitimate and rewarding. Although a minority view, it had the advantage of being based directly upon experience. It came from Latin America, the only part of the world where student representation in university administration has not merely

* *University Autonomy—its meaning today*, International Association of Universities, Paris, 1965.

been tried but more or less universally adopted in varying degrees. At the faculty level and even at the university level, students are there represented on councils and they sometimes take full part in their work, though, of course, they remain in a minority (there are restrictions on their powers in some countries—see the report of Professor Romero Brest). In the particular circumstances of Latin-America this student participation, it was maintained, has proved very successful.

i) It provides an example of practical democracy in societies where this is greatly needed.

ii) It gives young people their proper place and the practical apprenticeship they need in societies which a high birthrate makes structurally young, and where the shortage of cadres means that promotion to posts of responsibility comes at an early age.

iii) It brings more than a mere "feedback" to the academic staff—more than information about the reactions of those who are taught. It frequently provides new and original ideas.

iv) Doubtless it increases the political involvement of universities, particularly in that student representatives are often chosen not simply because of their personal capacities, but because of their political allegiances. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to infer from this that such students are mere puppets manipulated by party organizations. It means, on the contrary, that—in common with many of their professors—the students believe that universities have an important role to play in educating the national political conscience and that, without being drawn into actual party struggles, they should give attention to the great political options which will determine the future of their countries. In societies where the army has a political position and the church too—to take only two examples—why should the universities, devoted to rational analysis, seek to eschew all political influence.

v) Students do not congenitally lean toward facility or pedogical demagogy. Their leaders chosen from among the most experienced students, usually show considerable maturity.

There was little evidence that the discussions of the working party produced any noticeable reconciliation of these two conflicting points of view. It was stressed that in many countries (the United Kingdom and the United States, for instance) students are usually a good deal younger than their Latin-American counterparts, and that the question of student representation therefore arises in quite different ways. However, one member of the working party, though not entirely converted to the minority point of view, felt that he might in future be less disquieted by the idea of students one day taking part in the deliberations of university councils.

A last point should be noted under this heading. Many universities have set up a series of more restricted committees, sometimes not officially established, within or alongside their formal councils. The working party was particularly interested in the "development committees" which are active in a certain number of British universities in direct contact with the Vice-Chancellor. Reference is made to these later.

b) *The Head of the University.*

The powers of the head of a university vary greatly in the different university systems considered, as emerges from the consultants' reports. Many factors explain these variations, and some of them are sociological

in origin. One participant pointed out, for example, that in more "primary" societies where the family still plays a great role and where patriarchal patterns are still vigorously alive, a university head doubtless has a different standing from that in societies where democratic decentralization has become firmly established, or those in which the "managerial" idea has firmly taken root. The discussions of the working party, however, were concerned with administrative dispositions and arrangements, and in this it would seem that there is one factor which exercices a more decisive influence than all others on the powers of a university head — the manner of his appointment.

In a number of cases—not the most frequent—he is elected from among the members of the professorial staff or of the university council or senate, and external authorities, whether governmental or lay, have no part in this. This manner of appointment would seem at first sight to be the one most in conformity with university autonomy and the most intellectually satisfactory. It is followed by Oxford and Cambridge, by the majority of Latin-American universities and also by the West German Universities, where the role of the Minister is only to confirm the election. In these circumstances, the rector or vice-chancellor emerges from within the university itself. He represents it, often with splendid ceremonial, but at the same time his powers may be relatively limited. It would be interesting to try to determine how far this relative effacement in actual power, though not in academic rites, is inherent in the logic of the system. It can be maintained that an elected rector, whose authority has been conferred upon him by the express consent of those principally concerned, may be freer than any other in the exercise of authority. But it can also be asked whether it is possible at one and the same time to "represent" the university and to reform it, to be both its product and the force for its transformation. How far, in fact, can one be clearly *primus* if one is strictly *inter pares*? It may be noted that even if he is formally appointed by a Minister, the rector of a Soviet university chiefly owes his position to the choice of his colleagues, since he must be proposed by the university council. Professor Shvets insisted emphatically on the importance of this choice of one university man by others as rector, and this seemed to him more essential than any system of ministerial appointment. But at the same time it is evident that a Soviet Rector has extremely wide powers. He is *primus inter pares* in the sense that he is a scholar and a research worker among others, but he is in addition an administrator armed with very wide authority. Professor Shvets agreed that this duality often made the rector's position a hard one. Things are no doubt easier for a rector in West Germany, since he usually has limited authority in financial and administrative matters.

The elective system would seem to guarantee one thing, a limit on periods of office (even if re-election is not excluded). Appointment up to retirement age, above all in the period of transformation through which universities are passing, may quickly take on a rather ficticious character, in the sense that after a time a rector may cease to be a true representative of the university in its present and living form, and become a figure of its past—out-of-date, almost a ghost. The West German universities have remained true to the spirit of the elective system by limiting the rector's main mandate to a single year. But it cannot be denied that such a short period of office is harmful at a time when long-term planning is more than ever necessary and when continuity in administration is essential. For

this reason efforts are now being made in West Germany to extend the rector's period of office (see Professor Reinhardt's report). Except in the special case of the University of Konstanz, however, this period remains limited, as it is in Latin-America and also in the Soviet Union (where the rector, like all other holders of higher academic posts, is appointed for five years but may be re-appointed).

If the West German system represents one extreme, the other is provided by the United States system, where the president of the university is appointed by a lay board, with no direct intervention from the academic staff and where he need not necessarily be a university man by career. He is appointed with no limit of time, though he may be removed by the board, and he is thus able to carry out a long-term strategy for the university. His influence can be decisive, and his selection is generally believed by the board to be one of its most important functions. Even if his role as an administrator is predominant, he is not entirely free from the duality which was noted in the case of the Soviet Rectors. As Mr. Holden's report shows, two different lines of force seem to meet in him; in the eyes of the academic staff he represents the board, and the board regards him as representing the academic staff. This can sometimes be a source of strength, but when a serious conflict arises his position may become most uncomfortable.

There is a similar duality in the situation of the French rector. He must be a professor, but he is appointed by the President of the Republic and thus represents the government not only within the university but also throughout the academy (which groups all levels of education situated within a given administrative area). At the same time he is the president of the university council where, as a professor among colleagues, his status is that of *primus inter pares*. However his appointment does not depend on them, and it is difficult to see how in fact they could be responsible for his election since his authority extends to cover all the levels of education, and teachers in primary and secondary education would perhaps not agree to their colleagues in higher education electing a rector on their behalf.

The British vice-chancellor—with the exceptions of Oxford and Cambridge—is generally appointed by a university council on which there are both lay members and members of the academic staff. The part played by these lay members, in Professor Armytage's view, is a useful one, for they are usually better placed than professors to judge administrative capacities. The administrative side of a British vice-chancellor's work is very important. Professor Armytage even thought he runs the risk of not having enough time to seek new ideas, or even to be wary of those which seem likely to disturb the delicate balance of the university. It is therefore most important for him to have an office or staff responsible for working out new ideas and continually 'bombarding' him with them. This is the role of the development committees and of their counterparts in certain American universities.

What conclusions can be drawn from this? The working party did not seek to make recommendations with regard to the manner of appointment of university heads. Those among them from systems where university heads are elected by the academic staff—or where it makes a preliminary choice in the matter—were clearly very attached to them. The others emphasized how useful it was to have the help of lay members of councils and the value of choosing someone from outside the university—thus avoiding what Professor Armytage called 'incest'—who could bring in new perspectives. This division of opinion is perhaps explained by the

duality, already mentioned, of the position of the head of a university and by whether greater emphasis is laid on his role as an administrator or as a scholar. With these reserves, however, the working party was able to agree on the following points:

a) Where the head of a university is not elected from among its members by the academic staff and is predominantly an administrator, it is essential for him to dispose of means, formal or informal, of keeping in permanent contact with the academic staff and the ideas generated within it. On the whole it also seems preferable for the academic staff to have a part in the choice of the head of the university.

b) Where the head of a university is elected by his colleagues, there must be adequate arrangements for assuring continuity of policy: a fairly long period of office, rotation within a collegiate group, or the appointment of collaborators and assistants who will "outlive" him seems necessary.

The working party did not feel that it should put forward any ideal rule concerning the period of office. Those members belonging to systems where unlimited duration is customary did not oppose this, but they did point out that presidents and vice-chancellors appointed in this way rarely remained permanently in their posts. In the United States, many presidents resign when they themselves feel that they have passed the peak of their powers or their capacity for producing new ideas. In the United Kingdom, Professor Armytage said, the average "life" of a vice-chancellor was about ten years. Professor Shvets was disposed to regard this length of service as generally satisfactory, an appointment for five years, once renewed. In all circumstances it seemed, there were factors which tended to limit the period of time for which university heads could function satisfactorily. Not least among them were the difficulty of the tasks involved and the exhaustion they could produce.

c) *Assistants to the Head of the University.*

The working party did not dwell at length on this question. Some assistants of this kind are members of the academic staff. They may sometimes be elected—the vice-rector in Latin-America, for example, or the pro-rector (who is usually the predecessor of the rector in office) and the *rector designatus* (his successor-elect) in West Germany. Assistants are sometimes chosen by the rector himself (subject to ratification by a Ministry) and work under his authority, as is the case with Soviet Pro-Rectors who number from three to five, each specializing in a clearly defined field of activity (teaching, research, finance, etc... see Professor Shvets' report).

In other systems, these assistants are not strictly-speaking members of the academic staff but have the status of full time administrators. This applies to the registrars of British universities who have very important functions and, like vice-chancellors, are generally appointed by a university council in which the academic staff and lay members are both represented. Dr. Dafaalla pointed out that there was perhaps a risk of an excessive concentration of administrative power in the person of the registrar, at least in certain African universities. However, to appoint two or more registrars would obviously involve difficulties of co-operation between them.

In the United States, although there is no very clear procedure for their appointment, professional administrators are numerous. They are usually appointed by the president himself from among candidates known to him or recommended to him by others.

Beyond this listing of actual situations, it may perhaps be pointed out

that the systems which involve the sharpest distinction between administrative bodies and academic bodies and which have lay or semi-lay boards, have a greater tendency than others to develop a professional administrative apparatus independent of the academic staff. This question of administrative and academic assistants for the head of the university seemed too embedded in particular university administrative structures for any general recommendation to be put forward about it.

d) *Administrative Direction.*

The foregoing paragraphs on university heads and their assistants could of course have been partly included in this section. Similarly it was inevitable that mention of the non-university boards which exist in some systems should be made in the section dealing with university councils. There is, in fact, no fixed dividing line between the purely administrative and the purely academic. Distinctions between them—and these are marked in some systems—can be useful in practice and facilitate a convenient division of responsibilities. But this should not obscure the fact that all university activity involves an administrative side. The assessment and choice of resources is essential in all working methods and is thus an integral part of academic work, particularly in the sciences. All administrative decisions immediately affect teaching and research. An overlapping of academic and administrative authorities, as is the case in many countries in Latin-America, would thus seem quite natural. Viewed in this light, any separation between administrative and academic bodies would seem to be anomalous, were it not for the fact that the material resources at the disposal of universities are not self-produced but are obtained in one way or another from society. University resources are doubly the resources of the community as a whole. First because they are drawn from the general wealth of society; second because these resources, until they become integrated with the university (as a book or a test-tube for example), are completely passive in relation to the dynamic of knowledge. Money, bricks and mortar have no pre-destined scientific vocation and have to be used in the ways compatible with their inherent natures. It is not surprising, therefore, that universities should call in the help of men who are experts in handling them and who at the same time, represent in one way or another those social groups and interests which, through public financing or private subsidies, direct a part of their resources towards universities and expect a number of services from them in return.

Arguments of this kind can justify either autonomous administration or one which involves lay councils or government participation. The truth is that systems in which there is administrative intervention in neither of these forms (even if financial resources are provided from outside) are exceptional. Other than Oxford and Cambridge, examples can be found in a number of Latin-American countries where, as Professor Romero Brest pointed out, the university must be protected against the instability of political regimes and society itself. The Soviet system, among those closely linked to the State, would seem to be one of those in which the strictly university authorities (rector, dean, university council, faculty councils) have the most extensive administrative power, particularly in the allocation of resources. In the West German system, marked as it is historically by a clear distinction between university bodies and state financial management, there seems to be a new tendency towards the gradual absorption within the university of powers previously wielded by

the state, through a process of delegation (see, particularly, the observations in Professor Reinhardt's report on administrative boards, the chancellor system, etc.).

Professor Reinhardt was in favour of this development but in general none of the participants expressed strong objections to the administrative systems characteristic of university life in his own country, whether these involved complete autonomy, lay or semi-lay councils, or close governmental links. They did not seek to elaborate very much on the detailed information given in their respective reports. They were more concerned to explain how these structures, more or less taken for granted, could be applied to the new tasks facing their universities, and particularly those of inter-university co-operation, and co-operation with society in general.

II

UNIVERSITY RESPONSIBILITIES

To be logically done, an examination of university structures would have to be concluded by an examination of their inter-relations. Such an analysis, however, cannot be made in the abstract. These relations arise from the execution of actual taks and not in a vacuum, and it would be entirely misleading to try to deal with them one after the other, like the succession of links in a chain. Together they form a whole which influences and mediatizes each particular relationship. Between a professor and a dean, for example, relations are modified by innumerable others and by the network which they form as a whole. To study them in isolation would be to risk distorting them completely.

For these reasons, the working party decided to look at some main university responsibilities and to try to see how they were dealt with in practice. They were thus able to confirm—as indeed they were all well aware in the first place—that meeting these responsibilities inevitably involved interventions from outside the university and that these, in their turn, influenced many relationships within the university itself. It was through its examination of university work and the logical extension of this examination that the working party came to consider relations between the university and the "outside world".

A) *Teaching.*

To have taken up problems of curricular content would have carried the working party beyond its terms of reference. Problems of structure had been looked at in relation to the academic staff and university subdivisions. With regard to teaching, therefore, participants limited themselves to re-affirming the following points:

a) Teaching systems must be flexible enough to be able to absorb both new disciplines and new combinations of disciplines easily.

b) Departments and faculties should have very wide freedom in elaborating and proposing teaching programmes, even if the university as such must supervise their balance and the maintenance of academic standards. Ideas on the organization of university studies ought to flow upwards rather than downwards—and this is perfectly possible even when it is a ministry which sets the general outlines of curricula. The Soviet

Union may serve as an example of this, for though the Ministry establishes programmes of study, it does so on the basis of proposals and suggestions which come up from the institutions concerned.

c) In planning their teaching, universities must pay attention to the needs of the society around them, though they must of course respect the imperatives of knowledge itself. A permanent dialogue should go on between universities and other interested authorities. The need for this is particularly evident where the State accords precise professional rights to the holders of university degrees and diplomas (as in France and the Soviet Union) or where universities provide preparation for state examinations (West Germany). Another important point, now that universities are less and less able to teach all branches of knowledge, is that they should co-ordinate their teaching programmes for a whole country or region. For this, of course, special planning agencies are necessary—a question which the working party took up later. In countries where universities do not themselves undertake the training of secondary school teachers, or only partially do so they should be closely associated with such training. This was considered later by the working party when it examined the general question of relations between universities and other institutions.

B) *Research.*

Now that research is involving bigger and bigger resources in an increasing number of fields requiring complex inter-disciplinary teams, it can no longer dispense with planning. Universities have had centuries of experience in planning their teaching programmes but for many of them the organization of research is a relatively new problem. Although regarded as an essential function of the university, research was for a long time believed to belong entirely to the realm of individual creative work. The subjects of research were known to everyone and each research worker attacked his chosen problem, alone or with a few colleagues, and with very modest resources. In the nineteenth century, the German universities led the way in putting systematic emphasis on research work in universities and in methodically making provision for it. This led to the setting up of a series of research institutes parallel to the faculties. These, however, were still conceived of as working instruments placed at the disposal of a single person—the head of the institute worked and directed the work of others on problems he himself chose. His freedom was long considered to be one of the most fundamental conditions for creative work.

There followed the modern phenomenon of an acceleration in scientific research and discovery, more astounding than that of history itself and doubtless one of its prime motivating forces. Many universities were taken unawares. They had no way of coping with these new developments and no funds to meet their voracity. Research workers, heads of departments and institutes, following their old independent ways, themselves tried to raise funds from benefactors, foundations, national research organizations and governments. In many cases the universities, as such, remained powerless to regulate or control the increasing activities of their research workers, which depending on the initiative of particular individuals and the generosity of benefactors, were capable of upsetting university equilibrium and bringing about all sorts of developments which bore no relation to a concerted university plan. And while this was happening, society, governments and great organizations financing research, all concerned

both with the importance and the mounting cost of research, sought to create a strategy for scientific research, to establish priorities and to co-ordinate efforts. As a result, and above all through the control of financial resources, they were able to impose a pattern on university research work which universities, as such, could not even discuss.

This is the kind of danger now threatening many university systems, though considerable freedom, in itself precious, still remains for many research workers or heads of research institutes.

In the United Kingdom, universities have only very limited funds for research. Research projects usually are born among small groups of university experts, and if funds are not available for them, they are usually, with the consent of the vice-chancellor or the registrar, submitted to one of the large state research organizations described in Professor Armytage's report. The central university authorities have little part in this. The senate or council only intervenes if an entirely new subject is involved, and even then its agreement is hardly more than a formality. Among the disadvantages of this system is the considerable risk that research teams and infra-structures which have been set up for a particular project become unemployed when it is finished, if they have not been integrated into a long-term university plan.

In the same way, in the United States, most research is financed by funds outside the university budget, particularly by private foundations and by agencies of the federal government. There is, however, a careful attempt to plan the distribution of funds from these sources and account is taken of the possibilities and perspectives of each university. Consent by central university authorities is generally a matter of routine.

In West Germany, research workers and above all directors of institutes freely choose their research programmes provided they can obtain funds for them, usually from the State, from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (German association for scientific research) or from private companies. Here again, however, it must be noted that national organizations and particularly the *Wissenschaftsrat* (scientific council) are trying to co-ordinate research and to create "centres of gravity" for particular disciplines in certain universities. This policy limits the freedom of institutes insofar as it has an influence on the granting of state funds (by the Federal Government or the *Land* Governments).

In Latin-America, as has been already mentioned, universities often create research structures which are separate from teaching structures. The University of Buenos Aires, for example, has institutes where the director is appointed by the faculty and to which academic staff and advanced students may be sent for varying periods. These institutes carry out their own research projects and derive their resources both from the university and from national organizations for the advancement of science. The choice of research subjects is particularly important for these institutes, given the urgent development needs of the country and the shortage of resources.

The situation is similar in Africa.. Until recently research workers at the University of Khartoum, for example, themselves proposed subjects for research, but frequently their proposals had little bearing on the social needs around them and this raised fears of state intervention in research questions. It is now felt that research proposals should come from faculty councils so that teamwork may be directed towards important problems. It is urgent for universities to control and plan their own research work.

Central planning by the university appears to be more fully carried out in the Soviet system than in any other. Research projects in Soviet universities are first worked out at "chair" level, then submitted to the faculty council which makes a first selection, and then to the university council which carries out a second selection. Projects chosen in this way are placed in an order of priority and submitted either to the Ministry of Higher Education of the Republic concerned or to the Ministry of Higher Education of the Soviet Union, which provide the necessary funds.

Ideas thus come from below upwards but they have to go through a series of controls both at the university level and at that of the Republic or the Union. Outside this system, university research workers may also make direct approaches to the specialized ministries or to industrial collectivities and negotiate research contracts with them. Such contract research seems to exist in all university systems. It provides a response to particular needs of industry and at the same time gives individual research workers a certain freedom of manœuvre.

This freedom, the working party felt, remains very precious, but whether one likes it or not, it has to be reconciled with the now imperious needs of co-ordination and indeed of coherent planning of research. The working party's conclusions on this subject may be summarized as follows:

a) Planning of this kind may be less urgent in countries which possess very large resources. The proliferation and multiplicity of research projects may involve some apparent wastage, but can also be very productive. The richer countries whose resources are nonetheless limited (the United Kingdom and West Germany, for example) now feel the need to elaborate national scientific policies. Far from making planning at the university level superfluous, they make it all the more necessary. If they are not to become mere agents of national scientific policies, the universities must take part in their preparation according to their own needs, their special capacities and their resources.

b) In developing countries, it seems even more necessary for universities to organize their own research and co-ordinate it with social needs, particularly by concerting their own efforts with those of government and planning bodies.

c) Insofar as government bodies may tend to have too narrowly utilitarian an outlook towards research, universities must seek to "educate" them and stress the importance of theoretical work. It is a university responsibility, both nationally and internationally, to emphasize the importance of fundamental research.

d) There can be no hope, however, that the establishment of priorities in research questions, the relative importance of pure research and applied research and the compromises necessary between free and planned investigation can ever be settled once and for all. They will always be one of the principal elements of that dialectic which marks the living university. And it must be stressed again that this dialectic should operate at all levels—within departments and faculties, within the central organs of the university and in relations between universities and the nation.

e) Lastly, national scientific policies as they become more rigorous and more imperative, must not lead universities to neglect international co-operation in research and mutual aid in the training of research workers. Research is and must become ever more truly the common enterprise of all humanity.

C) *Budget.*

The establishment of the budget is obviously an essential act of university life and exercises great influence on it. In many university systems credits for research do not figure in the budget; this is an obstacle to the integration of research into the general planning of the university's development and tends to place it outside the range of discussion by the central university authorities.

In the opinion of the working party, the allocation of resources should be discussed between all the interested parties: chairs, departments, faculties and the university itself. These discussions, moreover, should take place both before and after the establishment of the budget—on the drawing up of estimates and on the use of funds actually voted.

In Latin America the state provides almost all the resources of the public universities. In the Argentine the law on "the independence of the universities" stipulates that the funds allocated each year may never be less than those for the preceding year. The universities draw up their draft budgets annually on the basis of the needs of their faculties and other constituent bodies. In preparing these drafts they follow the criteria generally applicable to bodies dependent on the state as well as such rules as they may themselves have fixed. The draft budgets of the universities are then submitted to the government services responsible for drawing up the national budget which has to be approved by Congress. The inter-university council, which is composed of the rectors of all the national universities, intervenes in this process at two stages: 1) when the draft budget is being prepared, it sets certain criteria for its elaboration, notably with regard to requests for increased allocations for university development and 2) when the national budget has been approved and increases have been sanctioned, it reviews the distribution of the increases between the different universities, taking account of various factors such as the stage of development of each university, numbers of students, numbers of graduates and the size of academic staff, etc.

The law on "the independence of the universities" also makes provision for a "university fund". This allows for the creation of a permanent and cumulative fund into which is paid the balance of any allocations remaining unspent at the end of each year.

In the Soviet Union, too, the establishment of a university budget follows certain pre-defined rules. In terms of the national economic plan, the state fixes the number of students, first of all for each specialization and then for each university. The number of students is thus known in advance. The credits allocated to each university depend upon the number of its students and its development plans, established according to norms laid down by the ministry. The rector draws up his application for credits in accordance with these rules. When the amounts have been finally agreed upon by the ministry and remitted to the university, the rector proceeds to allocate them with the help of the university council and his own restricted council and in agreement with the deans who are members of it. Generally speaking, about 50% of the overall budget is allocated to the faculties and these have the responsibility for further distribution among their "chairs". The remaining 50% is at the rector's disposal and is employed for central administration, the maintenance or construction of buildings, the payment of salaries, etc. This again means that much budget discussion takes place *a posteriori*, when its overall size has been determined.

The situation is different in West Germany where procedures vary from university to university but where budget proposals are everywhere worked out at "chair" level, then discussed at faculty level and then, in varying ways, at university level. The draft budget is then submitted to the minister, who in turn submits it to the *Land* Parliament which votes the credits within the general framework of the state budget. Except for Sarrebruck and Berlin, which receive an overall sum which they can themselves allocate, credits are voted item by item and there is thus little opportunity for discussion *a posteriori*. Changes are taking place however, and the new tendency is to give more and more freedom to universities in the allocation of funds allotted to them (see Professor Reinhardt's report).

In the United States, budget proposals are also worked out at departmental level. They are then transmitted to a committee, on which the president and various financial administrators sit, and are finally submitted to the board of the university. When the board has fixed the budget, departments are expected to use the credits allotted for precisely defined purposes. Unspent funds are returned to the university treasury. In the American state universities, budget proposals prepared by the university are generally examined by a committee of the state legislature and then submitted to the legislature itself. Federal authorities play no part. Private universities raise their own funds and the help of lay boards is particularly useful in this.

Lastly, in the United Kingdom, preparation of a university budget is particularly complex since it begins at the level of departments and faculties, goes, where this exists, to the university development committee and then to the university council (usually having some lay members) from here it is transmitted to the University Grants Committee. This committee may re-open discussion of the budget with the vice-chancellor or other representatives of the university. The special nature of the British University Grants Committee, an intermediary and a "buffer" between the Government and the universities, through which funds are distributed on a quinquennial basis, has often been described and praised in university circles in many countries. Professor Armytage described the system in his report, but stressed during the discussion that the Committee's role as a "buffer" is changing. The rising scale of government grants to universities is creating a growing need for the rationalization of expenditure. Enlightened amateurism is proving inadequate and professionals are indispensible particularly in highly technical fields such as architecture and university building. The University Grants Committee will thus have to have a much larger fulltime and specialized staff than in the past. This will enable it to play a more active part in university budgeting and particularly to impose certain rationalizations in administrative methods, building programmes and so on. Confronted with this—which in some ways can be seen as a growth of state control—the Committee of Vice-Chancellors, a purely inter-university body, feels the need to strengthen its own organization so that it may take an overall look at university problems and prepare a long-term policy in the hope of avoiding improvisation and re-adjustment to financial cuts.

It seems, therefore, that there is a growing centralization and a partial transfer of budget discussions to the level of national bodies in a university system, which until very recently, was extremely decentralized and distinguished by a high degree of autonomy for individual universities.

The method of drawing up university budgets in the United Kingdom

is advantageous in that it favours long-term planning, but the quinquennial period on which it has been based is no longer thought to be entirely satisfactory. There are proposals for adopting triennial periods, or a six-year period divided into two parts. This would introduce greater flexibility and make adjustments easier. The principle of long-term budgeting for university development would be retained, however, and the working party felt that this should be adopted as widely as possible.

An annual budget may be convenient for current expenditure, but it makes it impossible to work out a sufficiently continuous development plan. As in many countries university budgets are part of the state budget, which is annual, it appears difficult to envisage a longer period. Nonetheless, it is essential to look for formulae to overcome this difficulty. In the Soviet Union, university budgets are annual for current operating expenditure but are quinquennial for development and the bigger investment programmes. The quinquennial budget can be revised, but only upward, so that universities are sure of their minimum funds.

In the United States, the private universities have annual budgets and those of state universities are usually biennial, but it is widely felt that these periods should be extended for investment programmes.

Long-term planning can only be efficient if universities have the necessary information, and competent projection techniques. They specially need to be able to predict the size of their student enrolments in relation to social needs. In the Soviet Union, this problem is simplified, since student numbers are fixed by national development plans. Where this is not so, extrapolations of figures must be made, but these must be continually verified and adjusted. The British University Grants Committee is to undertake this task in the future in liaison with governmental manpower services. The American universities also are trying to look ahead as carefully as possible. Many of them have development committees, or administrators who are exclusively concerned with future planning. In their search for efficiency and a rationalization of their methods, many of them are carrying out important operational research.

III

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Very frequently, as was observed earlier in this report, top university structures are linked with the "outside world" and in some cases are even part of it. In the same way, it was seen that university activities are in contact with society in general and that their accomplishment depends on these relations. University administrative systems, therefore, are never isolated but are articulated with other institutions. The relationships are extremely numerous and complex and there could be no question of examining them all in the short time available to the working party. It decided therefore to look first at university relations with the most representative institutions of society in general, that is to say, the state and public authorities. It then made a more rapid review of relations with some other institutions particularly important for universities and especially those concerned with teaching and research.

A) *Government.*

Relations with governments were under discussion throughout the meeting and are, moreover, described in some detail in the consultants' reports. In general, the working party had no difficulty in agreeing that relations between governments and universities were everywhere growing closer, even in university systems where traditionally they had been weak or even non-existent.

In the United States, the distrust of interference by the government in university matters was particularly strong but the tendency for relations to become closer is now evident. The creation of the Land Grant Colleges, it is true, began a certain tradition of mutual help between the public authorities and higher education, and many state universities have since come into existence. But they all depend on the various State Legislatures and not on the Federal Government; the competent state authorities are usually content to finance the state universities and appoint the members of their governing boards, but generally do not interfere in their internal workings. Whilst the United States Federal Government has no ministry of education as such and little direct responsibility in educational matters, its agencies are financing an increasingly large part of university research as well as a number of educational programmes, particularly scholarship programmes. Thus, even if only in financial matters, links are increasing and becoming of considerable significance. Mention is made later in this document of the growing evidence that this will soon be accompanied by more systematic federal participation in certain fields of higher education.

In West Germany, the system is equally decentralized. All universities are state institutions but they come under the authority of the different *Länder*. As in the United States, the importance of various bodies operating at the federal level is increasing. The Federal Government, for instance, makes research grants while the Scientific Council—which is the product of an agreement between the Federal Government, the *Land* Governments and the Universities—exercises an important influence on university planning at the national level and on the allocation of research tasks. It has recently published proposals for the reform of curricula which are certain to leave their mark on West German higher education, even if they are not fully adopted.

In the United Kingdom, increasing links between universities and the government are shown by the growth of many councils and regional or national organizations, governmental or semi-governmental, which together form a complex system described in detail by Professor Armytage in his report. They include the University Grants Committee (whose powers are increasing), examination boards (concerned with university admissions and on which universities are represented), organizations for the financing of research, regional planning councils (sometimes chaired by a vice-chancellor) and many others. This diversity, seen from outside, might seem excessive but it no doubt reflects the present transitional stage of affairs. In any case it illustrates clearly the growing inter-linkage of universities with the government and is accompanied by closer links between the universities themselves (particularly through the Committee of Vice-Chancellors).

In the Soviet Union, universities are linked with the state in two ways. At the Union level, the ministry of higher education and specialized secon-

dary education has special pedagogical responsibilities and supervises academic standards and teaching and research programmes. At the level of the separate Republics, the corresponding ministries are more specially concerned with the financing of education.

Lastly, in the African countries, the ministries of education and finance are usually represented on university councils, even when the universities are not, strictly speaking, state institutions. This representation, however, does not always seem enough to ensure full understanding and co-operation between universities and governments, though it is obvious that this is particulary necessary in terms of development.

If this general tendency towards a strengthening of the bonds between universities and governments seems everywhere evident, the ways in which they are organized are too varied for any general recommendations to be applicable.

The working party stressed the hope that means could be found of improving and extending the university—government dialogue, but it recognized that it is a fallacy to speak of "government" in the abstract. There are many different types of state organization and not all of them lend themselves to co-operation with universities to the same extent. Where political conditions are comparatively stable, a certain affinity between governments and universities can be perceived in the sense that the universities, by transmitting cultural values and promoting the advance of learning, play a double role which can be most welcome to governments. But this is not always the case and Professor Romero Brest stressed the point. In many Latin-American countries relations between universities and the state cannot be stable since the state itself is unstable. A government may be in power quite arbitrarily and thus tend to suppress democratic freedoms. Even when it is legally in power, it may be reactionary in character and distrustful of a progressive spirit in the universities. When the government is itself progressive, its relations with universities tend to improve noticeably, but it is rare for distrust to disappear completely. This explains the insistence with which Latin-American universities try to guard their autonomy. This does not imply that they have no wish to serve society at large. On the contrary, it is often because they wish to do so that they find themselves in conflict with the state. A minimum of co-ordination exists, however, and particularly through economic planning and scientific and technical research councils which are dealt with below.

B) *Other institutions of higher education.*

Relations with these are in some systems a particular aspect of relations with government—to the extent that they involve the state itself or some of its organizations.

In the Soviet Union, for example, all institutions of higher education are under the educational authority of the ministry of higher education and specialized secondary education of the Union, even if some of them are also linked to specialized ministries like those of public health, agriculture, industry, etc. All higher educational activities, moreover, are co-ordinated both at Republic and at Union level in the economic development plans whose commissions work in close liaison with the ministries of higher education.

In the United Kingdom, an important problem is that of relations between universities, teacher training institutions, and the various institutions

operating under the aegis of the National Council for Academic Awards, which constitutes a state form of higher education, to which must also be added the "Open University" (see Professor Armytage's report). If duplication is to be avoided, the tasks of all these need to be defined and co-ordinated. Professor Armytage felt that it might be useful to fuse the existing boards and organizations and set up a council for higher education, which would work with the University Grants Committee and through regional organizations. Another tendency, by which the universities themselves are beginning to strengthen their links through the Vice-Chancellor's Committee, has already been noted.

A similar situation exists in West Germany where co-ordination is partly achieved through the Scientific Council, partly through the Standing Committee of Ministers of Culture of the *Länder*, and partly through the West German Rectors' Conference.

In Latin-America, a number of countries have higher educational councils at the level of the ministry of education. In Mexico and Argentina, there are national university organizations. In the latter country, the rector's conference already referred to, principally has budgetary responsibilities but it will, no doubt, become increasingly concerned with the co-ordination of development plans, working in liaison with the planning committees set up in the different universities (particularly Buenos Aires) and with the National Council for Economic Development. Similar councils exist in most Latin-American countries and are usually bodies responsible to the President of the Republic. Since they carry out analyses of needs in various sectors of the economy, they provide important elements for university planning.

In the United States, as shown in Mr. Holden's report, university co-ordination is somewhat sporadic. It exists chiefly through voluntary associations of universities. Academic diversity is held to a condition of vitality; but the need for a minimum of centralization is increasingly felt and it seems possible, perhaps probable, that the importance of various federal agencies, and particularly of the Office of Education, will increase, especially in the attempt to ensure greater equality of opportunity in education and in helping universities to analyse their new needs more effectively.

The general tendency is again that of growing co-ordination between the different institutions of higher education, even though a great deal remains to be done—particularly in those countries which can the least afford expensive duplication. In systems where co-ordination of this kind has given rise to a multitude of different organizations, there seems to be a growing desire for simplification. Dr. Dafaalla believed that a number of African countries were moving towards the creation of councils of higher education on which the universities, the other institutions of higher education and the governments would be represented.

C) *Teacher training institutions.*

Although these form a particular aspect of the relations dealt with above, the working party thought they deserved separate mention.

In many countries, some school teachers are trained by universities and others by separate training institutions.

This is notably so in the United Kingdom. Professor Armytage gives a full account of the situation in his report, which need not be repeated here except to mention that the present tendency is towards closer integration of the systems.

In Argentina, primary school teachers are trained in normal schools at the secondary level. Secondary school teachers are trained either by special institutes under the ministry of education or by universities, and a problem arises as to which of these two methods is the better. The first concentrates more on teaching methods, while the second puts emphasis on the subjects taught and allows for some contact with research. They are directed towards two quite different types of mind and Professor Romero Brest felt that it would be unwise to sacrifice one for the sake of the other. But she believed it essential to maintain and develop the training of secondary school teachers in universities since secondary education needed, in her opinion, to be enriched by the spirit of research and scholarly criticism.

A double system also exists in the United States where there are both teacher training colleges and university departments of education. The influence of Dewey's disciples is still strong in the former and in Mr. Holden's view, has a tendency to make teaching too easy-going. Secondary education suffers as a result and its teachers are underpaid and have little prestige. In university circles, and particularly at Harvard, a reaction against present methods is taking shape and it would seem that closer relations with universities would prove the best way of improving teacher training.

Duality also exists in the Soviet Union and is in some ways similar. There is no Dewey whose influence must be resisted, but it is nonetheless difficult to attract able people into the teaching profession since teachers are much less well-paid than are people who choose careers in research and industry. Those who have obtained diplomas from teacher training institutes have little option but to enter schools, but some of them follow correspondence courses or evening classes and try in this way to get into other professions. University students have little difficulty if they wish to avoid teaching as a career. Yet the Soviet universities do all in their power to help the schools. They all have chairs of education and of psychology open to students in all fields which can lead to teaching as a career. The sciences of education are given very great importance in the Soviet Union. The universities also provide refresher courses for teachers, and are responsible for school textbooks, but for all their efforts they continue to feel that secondary education is not yet satisfactory and in a number of cases they set up their own secondary schools.

In West Germany, secondary school teachers are trained in the universities. Primary school teachers are generally trained in colleges of education. Collaboration between them is growing closer and the colleges of education are hoping to achieve university status. This is one of the fields in which higher education is evolving rapidly but, as in other countries, recruitment to the teaching profession presents many problems.

In the Sudan and other African countries, school teaching is often regarded as a last resort career and this poses very grave problems. In this critical situation, several countries, not only in Africa, oblige students whose studies have been made possible by state scholarships to teach in the schools for a certain period. In the United Kingdom, it has even been suggested that teaching should be a form of national service.

The working party agreed that since a basic factor was that teachers are very badly paid in most countries, it was not possible for universities themselves to provide a remedy in these critical situations. But it believed that they could give great help by being more closely concerned with teacher

training. They could thus prevent school teachers feeling intellectually isolated and cut off from research work and they could try to improve the prestige of the teaching profession by lending it some of their own.

D) *The training of nurses and technicians.*

The working party also looked at the training of nurses and technicians which in many countries, in common with teacher training, was suffering from poor recruitment and whose products did not enjoy the prestige which their importance to society in general justified.

This was particularly true in the developing countries where these occupations are entirely without traditions and are generally considered very humble. But it is true also in the developed countries, and there are serious shortages of personnel in these occupations in many of them.

The working party felt that universities could again help in this by bringing some of their authority and prestige to the training for these occupations.

In medicine, there is a need for more and more highly-qualified auxiliaries (for example, computer technicians) and the nursing profession at its higher levels has also become highly technical. These occupations require knowledge of a range which justifies university training for them. In many American universities courses are therefore organized for nurses, some of them at the post-graduate level. Some British universities (Manchester, for example) have also established or are establishing degrees for nurses and are helping the hospitals' with which they are closely linked to train their staffs, particularly their technicians. The university contribution to this can take two forms: direct responsibility for training higher nursing personnel and help to the hospitals' own schools, which in most countries train the majority of people in these occupations (in the Soviet Union there are special schools for this). The working party felt these forms of help merited careful study above all in countries where the nursing profession was particularly in need of support.

The training of technicians in general raises similar problems, particularly in the developing countries. Universities could encourage recruitment either by setting up special short training courses for them (a solution found in Argentina) or by co-operating with technical schools and particularly by admitting their best students. In West Germany it is possible to move from the engineering schools into the technical universities and the Soviet Union students from the *technicums* can continue their studies through correspondence or evening courses, though they are obliged to do three years' practical work in their particular fields.

Universities, of course, are particularly concerned about the technicians whom they employ in their own laboratories. In the Soviet Union higher laboratory personel *(Starshie laboranty)* must have successfully completed higher studies, while middle-level personnel can study by correspondence or evening courses, and generally do so.

In the United Kingdom, a form of technician-graduate is beginning to appear. More and more frequently qualified technicians who have taken part in research work, are given the opportunity to write a thesis and obtain a masters' degree. Some even gain promotion to full academic posts.

The working party believed that arrangements of this kind could be most helpful, particularly in countries where work as a technician, in the

words of Dr. Dafaalla, "attracted nobody". A general point in all this was that the more universities undertook, the more they were obliged to undertake. Their prestige in some countries was so great that it was becoming increasingly difficult to attract young people into professions which were not in one way or another blessed by the universities. The question of how far the universities should go in this direction, seemed very delicate to the working party, which believed that the answer could not be the same for all kinds of society.

E) *Other research institutions.*

Given the need for co-ordination in research which it had emphasized so strongly, the working party felt that it should give brief attention to relations between university research and that carried out elsewhere.

It was particularly interested in the relations existing between the Soviet universities and the various Academies of Sciences in the Soviet Union, which play an important role in theorectical research (applied research is more the responsibility of the ministry of science and the network of research institutes which function, in various disciplines, under the authority of other ministries).

The Soviet Academy of Sciences, which is situated in Moscow and has a number of branches in other parts of the country, is a powerful organization exercising a decisive influence in all fields of knowledge. There are, however, separate Academies in the Republics and some of these also have very considerable resources. The Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, for example, has an annual operating budget of 100 million roubles and will invest a further 750 million roubles in the period 1966-1970. It is composed of 150 elected academicians, of 210-220 corresponding members, also elected, and a very large body of research workers, of whom about 400 hold doctorate degrees in the sciences. Its relations with the University of Kiev are close but they are based exclusively on mutual agreement and neither controls the other. The university trains research workers for the academy and the academy, in turn, welcomes a certain number of "aspirants". Many academicians are university professors and professors work at the academy. It has a co-ordinating council on which the universities are represented and this examines research projects which may be carried out in common (in which case the Academy provides the money). Some laboratories are common to the university and the academy and, by a recent decision of the Government of the Republic, the academy is allowed to construct buildings and laboratories for the university. Collaboration is thus close, but it remains voluntary.

The relations between the West German universities and the *Max-Planck Foundation* are somewhat similar, though perhaps they do not go so far. There are many personal links and some institutes are shared. The Scientific Council, moreover, provides some co-ordination of research at the national level in West Germany.

In the United Kingdom, there are over 40 research associations created by the government and industry which make arrangements with the universities, particularly in connection with preparation for certain doctorates. Some of the new universities have industrial research workers responsible for part of their teaching and some industries have financed institutes in the universities. Professor Armytage believed, however, that much of this co-operation, which was at present often sporadic

and a matter of expediency, should be organized more systematically.

In the United States, leave of absence can be given to university teachers for research work in government scientific organizations such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institute of Health, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as in private research units, many of which are oriented toward the social sciences. These organizations frequently contract for work to be carried out in universities and also engage university consultants, as does industry. The universities themselves, moreover, are beginning to pool their resources to finance certain specialized research installations.

In Argentina there are various research centres and a council for scientific and technical research (an autonomous body responsible to the President of the Republic) which makes research grants to the universities and other bodies, provides funds for study, travel and research abroad, and provides opportunities for permanent careers in research, including university research, and in some cases it supplements university salaries.

It would seem, therefore, that links exist between research in universities and research elsewhere in all the systems considered. There are exchanges of staff, installations are shared, and work carried out in common; but there is rarely any common overall systematic planning in this. It is an open question whether and in what circumstances such planning would be desirable.

* * *

There was no time for the working party to carry its discussions further, but in concluding them, it tried to draw one rapid general conclusion. Since the field of university administration was so wide, the discussions had inevitably involved a certain sketchiness; but the participants felt they had proved their usefulness, and as a termination of their work, expressed their belief that further exchanges of views on these questions would be of real value.

PAPERS ON
UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

33/34

UNITED KINGDOM

W.H.G. Armytage

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Sheffield.

British universities fall into six types : the collegiate, the Scottish, the civic, the federal, the technological and the new. Beside them other institutions are rapidly developing courses leading to degrees—colleges of commerce, education and technology—which form the backbone of what the Secretary of State for Education and Science, in a celebrated speech at the Woolwich Polytechnic on 27 April, 1965, described as the "public sector" of higher education. These two sectors have much more in common than might be supposed. To these two sectors, the autonomous and the public, may well be added a third; the "open University" based on correspondence courses. Originally conceived as a 'University of the Air' it was redesignated by the Minister for the Arts, who is charged with its implementation, in a speech to the annual conference of the Association of Broadcasting Staff on 14 May, 1966.

A. *Division of Authority within the University and Decision Making Mechanisms.*

Though all these institutions now find, in lesser or greater degree, an indulgent patron in the Department of Education and Science, they fall into two sectors: the autonomous and the public.

As institutions in the "autonomous sector" Universities have individual charters conferring that autonomy. This includes the right to appoint staff, admit students and determine conditions under which degrees may be awarded. Within that very broad framework there are numerous divergences of structure, constitutions and government that need explanation.

(i) At one end of the autonomous sector Oxford and Cambridge are governed entirely by their senior members; at the other and the newer Universities a large number of outside representatives have a say on their

governing bodies. Oxford and Cambridge Colleges are self-governing, sustained by fees and endowments and admit, teach and accommodate students but are subordinate to Congregation (Oxford) or the Regent House (Cambridge). In both cases the University examines for and awards degrees.

The London Colleges on the other hand, though they have their own governing bodies, are under the University Senate for academic and financial purposes, whilst the Welsh Colleges are governed by the Court of the University of Wales, acting through the council where finance is in question and through the academic board for academic matters.

In the civic Universities, there is a four tier unitary system: court, council, senate, and boards of faculties or schools. Court, analogous to a shareholders meeting, is a very large body representing every conceivable interest in the locality:—local M.P.'s, headmasters, trade unions, professorial associations, churches, local authorities, benefactors, former and often, current students. Meeting infrequently, perhaps twice a year it receives the Vice-Chancellor's report and formally offers major changes in ordinances. It is usually a gathering of friends of the University, and often nominates one, sometimes more, of its members to sit on the Council. Council is an executive body analogous to a board of directors and usually has a majority of laymen who give much time to university affairs, though it has a certain number of Professors and non-Professorial members as well. It is the executive committee of the University and works through committees where the expertise of laymen is most valuable, especially in committees on finance and buildings.

The real academic forum is Senate. Composed of professors and a certain portion of the non-professorial staff, it is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor and works through an extensive system of committees. As Senates have grown in size with the increase of the professoriate, these committees increase.

(ii) Perhaps the most recent development in some Universities is the establishment of a Committee concerning itself with academic development which, as its name implies, considers the implications of forward planning on the academic community. Senate receives, discusses and accepts reports from Boards of Faculties of Arts, Science, Social Studies, Engineering, etc., usually presented by the Dean of the Faculty concerned, who may also be, in turn, the chairman of his faculty board. Like Senate and Council this board meets, usually monthly, and, under its Dean who serves for a period of years, preserves a balance of requirements and standards between the subject departments represented on it. The lecturers are usually in a majority, and all academic matters affecting the particular degrees of the faculty are discussed here. Faculties usually impose their own admission requirements, subject of course to the approval of Senate, and ensure comparability of different courses within the Faculty. In Scotland the hierarchy is functionally the same but nominally different. The Vice-Chancellor is known as the Principal; the Court is known as the Assembly; the Council is known as the Court; the Senate as the Senatus Academicus, and sometimes the Faculties are known as Boards of Studies.

(iii) In all Universities the chief administrative officer is the Vice-Chancellor, the Chancellor being mainly a ceremonial figure, sometimes elected. Except at Oxford and Cambridge where the office rotates, Vice-Chancellorships are permanent appointments. That this pattern is affecting the Oxford and Cambridge Universities can be seen from the Franks

Report on the University of Oxford in 1966. This suggested a longer tenure of office for the Vice-Chancellor, and a resolution of the conflict of constitutional pressures between the Council or governing body of Oxford, and Congregation, the large, and only, organ through which the 'dons' express their views. This would involve curtailing the power of Congregation to reject legislation proposed by the council. Moreover it proposes that, to ascertain the opinion of the colleges, a council of the colleges should be set up. Between this and the Council "a continuing dialogue" was envisaged. College autonomy was, in some cases, to be curbed. Thus All Souls, it was proposed, should within three years submit a report on its policy and activities to the Vice-Chancellor and a specially appointed committee.

Recent observers differ as to the degree of democracy inherent in academic machinery. Sir Eric Ashby (*Technology and the Academics*, 1958, p. 101) considers that "By and large it is true to say that the main direction of flow of new ideas and proposals is from below upwards and not in the reverse direction"; while Professor G.L. Brook, (*The Modern University*, 1965, p. 185) quotes a verse,

"Along these lines, from toe to crown,
Ideas flow up and vetoes down"

as "a satirical description of the working of a modern University".

The 'public' sector exhibits a similar diversity. (i) Of the colleges of education, just under one-third are run by voluntary bodies, mostly churches, and the rest by local authorities. The cost of the voluntary colleges is met by the Department of Education and Science which also provides 80% of the approved capital expenditure; that of the local authorities by themselves. Academically all are members of 20 Area Training Organizations (A.T.O.'s) or institutes of education, all but one of which are University bodies on which are represented the l.e.a.'s, the teachers and the colleges. These institutes administer the examinations, and in most cases, arrangements for the B.Ed. degree.

Colleges of education set the precedent which Universities followed of establishing a central register and clearing house for admissions. Once admitted, candidates are eligible for grants, calculated on a means test for parents, that cover boarding and tuition, plus allowances for travelling and personal expenses. Most technical colleges are maintained or assisted by one or more local education authorities and are under governing bodies composed of representatives of those authorities as well as local industry and commerce. Their curricula are co-ordinated with regional needs with the help of 10 Regional Advisory Councils composed of similar representatives together with those of the Universities and technical colleges. They nominate members for the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce.

Students under the age of 18 rarely pay fees at these institutions, and above that age grants are given by l.e.a.'s on the same conditions as to Universities.

(ii) Arrangements for the government of the polytechnics are, as yet, not clear. *Cmnd.* 3006, of 1966 which announced the government's intention to create them, remarks "Before a polytechnic is designated account will be taken of the possibility of associating one or more colleges by merger or otherwise in order to form a more effective unit. It will be a condition of designation that the government and academic organization are on acceptable lines."

B. *Relationships to Government.*

(i) *The University Grants Committee (U.G.C.)*

To distribute the government grant of £690,000 voted by parliament for 1919-20 a standing committee of the Treasury was appointed 'to inquire into the financial needs of university education in the United Kingdom and to advise the government as to the application of any grants that may be made by parliament towards meeting them'. This standing committee was the University Grants Committee. Numbering nine, with services rendered by Treasury personnel, it was composed exclusively of academics. For the first time, Oxford and Cambridge were put on the grant list and the Irish universities transferred to their respective governments. These terms of reference were significantly widened after the second world war by the addition of '... and to assist, in consultation with the universities and other bodies concerned, the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of the universities as may from time to time be required in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs'.

The last clause, 'to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs' has been the warrant for its activities over the last twenty years. During this time the recurrent grant has grown to over £50 millions a year, still given on the original quinquennial basis. In spite of rising prices and great temptations, universities have kept within these, there being a total deficit of only £128,000 on an annual grant of £26 millions in the first post-war quinquennium (1947-52), and only £185,000 on £42 millions in the second (1952-57).

The committee considers its quinquennial visitations which begin in the third year of the quinquennium—to be an invaluable part of the procedure for determining grants. Not only do they provide background information for the universities' own estimates for the ensuing quinquennium and enable opinion and feeling to be sampled by discussions with all segments of the university population, but they enable the U.G.C. to 'put the universities in the national picture'.

The committee reported in 1964 that their last series of visitations 'proved how unaware some universities appear to be of some of the national factors (e.g. the differences in the pool of students between the years before 1962 and the years after 1962) which should be taken into account..., in making their plans'. To fit universities' own plans into the national plans, the U.G.C. has, over the years, established a number of sub-committees and panels. In the third post-war quinquennium, 1957-62, six new ones were established in addition to the four already existing for agriculture, medicine, technology and veterinary science. These were dentistry (established 1959), English as a foreign language (1961), management studies (1962), Oriental, African, Slavonic and East European studies (1961), new universities (1959) and building procedures (1961). These should not be confused with the panels of equipment assessors appointed for various sciences and technologies. The U.G.C. as now constituted has 22 members including its chairman (Sir John Wolfenden, CBE, MA) and deputy chairman (Sir Harold Sanders, MA, PhD).

Following the recommendations of the Robbins committee that a grants commission should be created with responsibility for the whole field of higher education, and the matching recommendations of the Trend committee of enquiry into the organization of civil science (cmnd. 2171,

1963), the U.G.C. was placed under the minister of state for civil science and the universities. This ministry was announced as a component of the department of education and science on February 6, 1964. It was to embrace civil science as well as universities, whilst another minister of state was to be responsible for schools. Both ministers of state were to be under a single 'overlord' minister.

The power of the University Grants Committee was increased by giving it direct access both to the new secretary of state and to the two ministers of state, whilst its membership was brought up to 22, thereby strengthening its own internal organization. Of its own accord the committee began in 1960 to preface its annual statistical returns by a general statement of its activities, since the interval between the quinquennial reports was too long in days of such rapid development. From being a preface this became, by 1965, a separate Annual Survey.

By 1965 the U.G.C.'s own view of its quinquennial policy had changed even more. Giving evidence on February 22 of that year its chairman told the estimates committee (Fifth Report, question 303, p. 50) that the sheer number of universities indicated that existing quinquennial practice 'may not be practicable in the present shape'. In its place he suggested 'either a threeyear period or a six-year period divided into two three-year periods, or a rolling quinquennium'. Either would involve a revision of the visitation policy. This was accepted by the estimates committee which recommended that such changes should be put into effect 'early in the next quinquennium'. But the estimates committee went still further by recommending that the secretary of state review the composition and responsibilities of the U.G.C. with a view to increasing both its part-time and full-time membership. From being a 'buffer' the University Grants Committee was to become a signal box, giving 'more constructive and effective guidance' to the universities in planning buildings and equipped with statistical, cost accounting, engineering and architectural departments to enable it to discharge the new role. It should also, continued the estimates committee, 'inaugurate an exercise to work out standard requirements for university buildings', examine the proposal that contractors tendering for constructing buildings should be asked to tender for their maintenance as well, and invite the National Buildings Agency, together with experienced contractors, to pool information on industrial building techniques. Equally significant was the suggestion (also from the estimates committee) that the University Grants Committee should undertake a survey of 'at least all major scientific departments in universities' to determine the degree of obsolescence in equipment.

At the end of 1965 these recommendations were being considered by the U.G.C.

(ii) *Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.*

Mr. J.P. Mackintosh, a former university teacher, suggested in the House of Commons on 5 July, 1966 that the U.G.C. should be replaced by a select committee on the lines of that for the nationalized universities.

Lord Robbins himself argued at the British Academy on 6 July, 1966, for a strengthened and more responsible U.G.C. 'to protect academic institutions against the cruder incursions of politics and to create an area in which freedom to maintain their own standards and initaite their own development is reasonably well presented'. He suggested that the responsibility of the U.G.C. should extend to co-ordination and policy making,

and report more frequently and extensively to reassure the public that it was doing this.

All this enhances the importance of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals as an active instrument for representing the views of the universities.

Mutual consultation amongst university principals began in Scotland in 1858, as the result of external suggestion, and in England in 1887, from internal need. The Scottish principals met to discuss changes in ordinances, their English counterparts to ask for money. These English meetings acquired a wider significance when in 1903 the allied colonial universities conference was held at Burlington House. To organize a second such conference, a home universities committee met in 1910. This gave birth to the Universities Bureau of the British Empire.

When during the first world war the bureau successfully proposed the idea of establishing the PhD in order to attract postgraduate workers to Britain, both English and Scottish vice-chancellors and principals met together on May 9, 1918, at the suggestion of A.J. Balfour to see what could be done to secure information for such postgraduates as might wish to come. Balfour also had in mind 'some permanent organ of communication and consultation, and if need be, even of common action in matters of common university interest, which could enter into relations with similar bodies which already exist in some of the allied countries'. Balfour's initiative exposed a number of other issues calling for such common consultations. Not only was the board of education providing more than a quarter of the revenue of their colleges, but the mooted establishment of the Secondary School Examinations Council rendered it necessary for them to express a common opinion. In fact, five years earlier, one vice-chancellor of Reading had proposed the establishment of a vice-chancellors' council composed of four representatives of each university under a permanent chairman. By 1918 the vice-chancellors were meeting four times a year.

After twelve years of such consultation the vice-chancellors secured from their respective universities in 1930 the mandate that 'it is desirable in the common interests of the universities of the United Kingdom to constitute a Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals for purposes of mutual consultation'. Thus fortified by this endorsement of their existence, the committee began to express a collective opinion on matters like salaries and external intervention and by 1946 decided that it 'could advantageously exercise a much greater measure of initiative than hitherto in preparing and presenting to the University Grants Committee and to other bodies, studies and recommendations on matters of common university interest and policy'. This 'greater measure of initiative' was reflected in A Note on University Policy and Finance in the Decennium 1947-1956 (1946), an argued case for balanced redevelopment of the universities to meet the country's post-war needs, and shortly afterwards in the publication of the report of a commission which it had set up on The Planning of University Halls of Residence (1948).

The Committee remains essentially a consultative body, though it holds an influencial and central position in university affairs. It meets, in London, every month except August and its membership has expanded to include not only the vice-chancellors of all the United Kingdom universities and the principals of the colleges of advanced technology, but also, in view of the special circumstances of those universities, the principal and four heads of colleges of the University of London, the principals of

the constituent colleges of the University of Wales, and the principal of the Manchester College of Science and Technology. The registrar of Oxford, the registrar of Cambridge, and the secretary-general of the Association of Commonwealth Universities also attend its meetings. The chairman of the committee is elected annually and usually serves for three years in succession. The secretary of the committee (Mr. A.A. Bath) is the deputy secretary-general of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, which provides the secretariat for the committee. The home universities make a special contribution to cover the cost of the secretariat, the office of which is 36 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1 (tel: Euston 8572).

In addition to setting up its own sub-committees, the committee has been instrumental in the establishment of several delegate bodies, representative of all universities to undertake specific tasks. The first, in 1952, was the universities' Committee on Technical Staffs, set up to provide central machinery for the determination of the salaries of university technicians; and the most recent, in 1965, was the Standing Conference on University Entrance which is currently undertaking a detailed study of university entrance requirements with a view to simplification of the present patterns. Side by side with the work of this body, the committee compiles annually, for publication by the A.C.U., a detailed Compendium of University Entrance Requirements for First Degree Courses in the United Kingdom. But the most significant of the bodies established by the universities on the recommendation of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals has undoubtedly been the Universities Central Council on Admissions, which was set up in 1961. It is to this that we must now turn.

(iii) *The Department of Education and Science.*

To render aid to British universities and colleges in a more effectual manner, the royal commission, sitting under the Duke of Devonshire from 1870 to 1875, recommended the establishment of 'a ministry to deal with science and education as a public service'. But it took the convulsive therapy of two major wars, and the adverse tilting of the economic balance of trade to build it up. During the first world war the universities branch of the board of education formulated a scheme whereby a small group of scientists and industrialists working under an advisory council were to disburse government grants for scientific research. This became the department of scientific and industrial research, whose chairman happened also to be the chairman of the University Grants Committe.

Three other state pipe-lines to carry research grants were established, two before, the other after, the first world war. The Development Commission (1910) helped rural industries and fisheries by linking them to university chemists, biologists, mycologists and entomologists. The Medical Research Council took shape following a committee appointed to administer a fund raised from a levy imposed by the National Insurance Act of 1911. This extended its helping hands to research units and groups in universities, hospitals and public health authorities. It also controlled the public health laboratory service, the clinical research board and the National Institute of Medical Research. The Agricultural Research Council was established in 1931, and like the department of scientific and industrial research its powers were redefined in 1956 by the Agricultural Research Act, which empowered it to establish or develop institutions or departments of institutions and make grants.

The research councils' grants for university research increased from

£3.1 millions in 1957-58 to £8.2 millions in 1961-62. This has been matched by a steady increase of moneys for scientific research derived from other government departments, and from industry. In all, such sources of revenue which comprised 6.5 per cent. of the universities' total income in 1956-57, rose to 11.1 per cent. by 1961-62. The University Grants Committee considered this dual system to be 'essential to the orderly development of scientific research in the universities'.

After the second world war other bodies, like the National Research Development Corporation (1948) and the Nature Conservancy (1949), were set up; one to encourage and finance the adoption of new ideas (like the hovercraft), the other to provide scientific advice on the conservation of flora and fauna. The most significant of the bodies set up during the second world war was the 'directorate of tube alloys' as it was then known. Transferred to the U.S.A. during the war, its work on atomic energy was resumed in Britain after 1945 under the ministry of supply. The first British atomic bomb detonation in 1952 led, two years later, to the transfer of work on atomic energy from the ministry of supply to a self-contained authority with its own administrative organs. Under Sir Edward Plowden as chairman, the Atomic Energy Authority (1954) operated in conjunction with electricity authorities and the manufacturing industries, to assist universities or firms with loans for research and to provide training and education in atomic energy. Primarily a research and development authority, it was organized into two groups, research and industrial, employing over 20,000 staff. As custodian of the country's most cherished military secrets, as well as a prime competitor in the international scientific race, the atomic energy authority was hedged physically, legally and financially from the more obvious disadvantages of popular control. A National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science (N.I.R.N.S.) was created in 1958, financed through the atomic energy vote. Since it was to provide universities with common facilities, and was virtually governed by the universities it brought them still further into the orbit of government. An advisory council on scientific policy was created to deal with civil science through a number of sub-committees (e.g. on manpower and technical information). The role of the advisory council was 'to advise the lord president of the council in the exercise of his responsibility for the formulation and execution of government scientifiz policy'. This government scientific policy included the organization of scientific manpower, overseas scientific relationships, space research, resources devoted to research and development, the organization of government research and various other matters. Its important power was that of initiating the discussion of problems.

So great had the scientific responsibilities of the lord president of the council grown by 1959, that he was re-designated minister for science. As such he also assumed responsibilities for participating in the work of new international agencies like C.E.R.N. (the European Organization for Nuclear Research) or E.S.R.O. (the European Space Research Organization), I.A.E.A. (the International Atomic Energy Agency) or O.R.C. (the Overseas Research Council created in 1959 to advise the privy council committee on overseas research); but the cluster of ad hoc organizations over which he presided, and their ramifications with the ministry of education, led to the appointment of a committee under Sir Burke Trend. Reporting in 1963 they recommended the establishment of three new agencies: a science research council divided into six divisions, a new

natural resources council and a new industrial research and development corporation. The first was to control the royal observatories, to finance post-graduate awards in science and technology, to supervise the National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science, space research, and the scientific aspects of the national commitment to C.E.R.N. and E.S.R.O. The second was to take over the functions of the nature conservancy and other environmental problems concerning geology, forestry and oceanography. The third was to take over the research stations managed by the department of scientific and industrial research as well as the work of the national research and development corporation. Though these three new agencies involved the dissolution of D.S.I.R. they did not affect either the agricultural or the medical research councils.

Above all, the Trend report recommended the strengthening of the minister of science. He was to take over from the other privy council committees (under which existing research councils operate) the powers of appointing governing bodies and of issuing formal instructions to them. Moreover he was to obtain a new advisory body, half of whom were to be scientists. He was to take over responsibility for co-ordinating research agencies, the national lending library for science and technology, and Aslib, whilst his staff was to be strengthened by new members and by exchange with the various agencies under him. The spirit of these recommendations was adopted when in 1964 a new department of education and science was established.

The estimates committee recommended in 1965 that the functions of the department of education and science in relation to collecting and processing information about national needs for graduates in industry and other sections of the economy should be enlarged. Since the existing catchment area of the department 'was not wide enough nor are relations with other government departments dealing with manpower sufficiently intimate', they envisaged future manpower needs being collected 'as scientifically and clearly as possible' so that the universities could be adequately informed of them. In addition they recommended that the department of education and science, the Treasury, and the University Grants Committee 'should undertake urgently a review of the quinquennial system', and that 'the changes should be put into effect early in the next quinquennium'.

(iv) *The Universities Central Council on Admissions.*

The 'trend' or increasing tendency of boys and girls staying on to take advanced level General Certificate of Education and to apply for university places, posed problems of admissions procedure. To solve them the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the United Kingdom appointed a committee in 1958. The two reports of this committee hastened the standardization of university admission procedure, whilst a third report in January 1961 proposed the establishment of a Universities Central Council on Admissions (U.C.C.A.).

As constituted in July, 1961, the U.C.C.A. consisted of representatives of each university in Great Britain; one for each 2,000 full-time students. To ensure that the U.C.C.A. could cope with the bulge in the size of the age group seeking university admission by 1964 a pilot scheme was initiated in September, 1962.

Cutting across the U.C.C.A. scheme was the centuries-old prestigious and influential open scholarship system operated by the colleges of Oxford

and Cambridge. A Committee of inquiry into the University of Oxford under Lord Franks had amongst its terms of reference to inquire 'whether existing arrangements by which colleges admit their students are sufficiently co-ordinated with the requirements and faculties of the university' In July, 1964 it was announced that both Oxford and Cambridge would become full members of the scheme and all applicants for admission to their colleges in October, 1966 had, for the first time, to apply through the U.C.C.A.

(v) *The Schools Council.*

Established in 1964 this independent body inherited the responsibilities of the Secondary Schools Examinations Council (established in 1917) for secondary school examinations (including those qualifying for matriculation) assembles representatives of the Universities, the Department of Education and Science and H.M. Inspectorate to operate 'co-operative machinery' to conduct research and enquiry into the curricula of schools. The continuity and effectiveness of its operational techniques is quite novel, resembling those of a commission in perpetual session. The diversity of present University entry requirements is but one of its current preoccupations; equations of the standards of University examining boards another. Since its orientation is towards the future, it could also be classified in a subsequent section as laying down guidelines of development.

(vi) *Council for National Academic Awards.*

On the principle that equal performance merited equal academic awards the Robbins committee recommended that degrees should be made available to those doing work of degree standard in institutions having no degree-awarding powers. They recommended that a Council for National Academic Awards be established on the lines of the National Council for Technological Awards then supervising the sandwich courses leading to the Dip.Tech.

When the former was established in September, 1964, by royal charter, it had far greater powers than the old National Council for Technological Awards whose responsibility for the Dip. Tech. it took over and continued. For its mandate was not restricted to technology, nor to sandwich-course degrees, comparable in standard to those at present conferred by universities but are available to both full-time and part-time students at institutions of higher education or research other than universities who have undertaken certain approved courses of study or research.

Within two years of receiving its charter 4,500 students were following 102 courses leading to its degrees in, amongst other subjects, business studies, mathematics, economics, sociology, accountancy and law. Further courses are likely to include languages, librarianship and town planning. Further degrees, M. Phil. and Ph. D., can also be obtained by work undertaken jointly in industry or commerce and the college. Thirty colleges were offering C.N.A.A. courses in August, 1966.

(vii) *Guidelines of Development.*

The expanding echelons of expertise demanded by modern society have necessitated the increasing use of specialist committees for developing certain areas of study along national guidelines rather than at the whim

of particular institutions. Eight such committees laid down the freeways for post-war expansion; the Barlow committee on scientific manpower (cmd. 6824; H.M.S.O., 1946) supplemented by the second report of the committee on veterinary education in Great Britain (cmd. 6517, 1944), the inter-departmental committee's, or Goodenough's, report on medical schools (1944), the Terviot committee on dentistry (cmd. 6727, 1945), the Clapham committee on social and economic research (cmd. 6868, 1946), the Loveday committee on higher agricultural education in England and Wales (cmd. 6728, 1945), the Alness committee on agricultural education in Scotland (cmd. 6704), the Scarbrough commission on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African studies (H.M.S.O. 1946), and the McNair committee on teachers and youth leaders (H.M.S.O. 1944). Developments charted by these reports enabled the civic universities to transform their academic and architectural image. Over the ensuing twenty years targets have grown; that set by the Barlow committee of 1946 for the production of scientists (and reached within two) was substantially raised by the Zuckerman committee (cmd. 8561, 1952). The progress of Oriental, African, Slavonic and East European studies, as recommended by the Scarbrough commission, was reviewed in 1961, and as a result ten centres were established for middle eastern, south asian, southeast asian, Chinese, Japanese, African, Russian and eastern european studies in nine universities.

Moreover the increasing output of universities has necessitated a fresh examination of the scope, purpose, constitution and organization of university appointments boards. This has been conducted by a committee under Lord Heyworth (H.M.S.O., 1964), the recommendations of which are currently being considered.

The sheer size of departments called for an examination of university teaching methods, a task conducted by the Hale committee (H.M.S.O., 1964). The position of Latin American studies has been examined by the Parry committee (H.M.S.O., 1965). Most recently (1965), audio-visual aids have been examined by a committee under Dr. Brynmor Jones, which recommended the establishment of central units to improve communications with institutions of higher education together with a centre to ensure co-ordination at a national level.

Recruitment to the Veterinary Profession, inquired into by a Departmental Committee in 1964 under the Duke of Northumberland (H.M.S.O., 1964) is now being considered by the U.G.C.'s Veterinary Sub-committee. Medical Education is currently being reviewed by a Royal Commission under Lord Todd, approved on 27th July, 1965.

Though the guidelines laid down by the committee under Lord Robbins in 1963 were rejected, the main target is now generally agreed; that 17 per cent. of the age group should enter full-time higher education by 1980, of which 380,000 are to be in universities. This represents an increase of 164,000 on the number of 1962-63. The immediate future, as seen in profile by the Robbins committee, was underlined when the government announced, on February 24, 1965, that of the 390,000 places in full-time higher education that would have to be provided by 1973-74, 218,000 would be in universities.

Further profiles were based on the size of the eighteen-year-old age group. In 1965 this was 963,000, the highest since the war. It will decline from 862,000 in 1966 to 803,000 in 1967, 766,000 in 1968, 743,000 in 1969 and 724,000 in 1970. From 738,000 in 1971 it dips to 730,000 by 1973, but rises to 901,000 by 1980, and possibly to 960,000 by 1985. The proportion

of this age group obtaining the minimum university entrance qualifications has also been rising by 0.37 per cent. per year in England, Wales and Scotland. By 1962 it had reached 7 per cent. Assuming the rise would continue, the Robbins committee estimated it would be 12.9 per cent. by 1980, by which time 17 per cent. of the age group would be entering full-time higher education. Of these 380,000 would be in universities. Put in another way, 40 per cent. of all entrants to higher education would be in universities by 1980, as opposed to 45 per cent. in 1962.

Since the demand for places rather than the manpower needs of the economy seemed to have influenced the Robbins committee's recommendations, an evaluation of those manpower needs was needed. This most difficult problem is at present being tackled by a unit for economic and statistical studies on higher education set up, with a grant from the Nuffield Foundation, at the London School of Economics. In association with the department of education and science this unit is also constructing a model of the educational system, designed to indicate how the education system may develop over the next 25 years and how it should be developed in the light of national economic targets. Its basis is to be a system of quantified data from which, given certain assumptions, forecasts can be made. Hence the importance of its investigations into the use of qualified manpower in industry, designed to ascertain the relationships between education, job and performance in over a hundred firms, beginning with the electrical industry.

In 1966 the department of education and science established a long term division, one of its objectives being 'to keep Robbins up-to-date'.

Further decisions affecting education and training will stem from the work of the national economic development council, established in 1962 'to examine the economic performance of the nation with particular concern for the plans for the future in both the private and the public sectors of industry'. Two years later its progress towards its general objective, a growth rate of 4 per cent. per annum, was announced, coupled to increased estimates of investment in, amongst other fields, education and housing. Here the computer model of the economy, built by a research group at Cambridge, under Professor Stone, is important. The most recent forecast is that of The National Plan (issued September 16, 1965) which envisages current costs at the universities rising to £159 millions by 1969-70 and capital expenditure in further education between 1964-65 and 1969-70 rising from £126 millions to £189,500,000. Though accepting the Robbins target of 218,000 university places by 1973-74, the plan exepcts 70,000 places for higher education in technical colleges to be available by the same date; 20,000 more than the Robbins estimate of 50,000. Over the same period places in colleges of education are to increase from 70,000 to 122,000.

C. *Selection Appointment, Promotion and Legal Protection of Academic Staff.*

40 per cent of recurrent expenditure on Universities is absorbed by salaries. About 11 per cent of the 19,000 university teachers are professors and the rest readers, senior lecturers, lecturers, assistant lecturers—a hierarchy generally accepted in most universities. Multi-professorial departments enable the principle of rotating chairmanships to be adopted.

They are appointed by the individual universities who reserve the right

whether or not to advertise in the public press. For senior appointments and personal invitations are issued. Candidates for promotion are assessed usually on three criteria: contribution to research, administrative efficiency and effectiveness as a teacher. Though most institutions apply only the first criterion, the second and third are employed where promotion to senior lectureships is at stake.

Most universities have an efficiency bar at the end of the third year of an assistant lecturer's tenure. Sometimes assistant lecturers are on annual appointments.

Once past the lecturer's 'bar' security of tenure is virtually assured, barring consideration of moral turpitude (e.g. seducing a student). No bar is imposed because of a lecturer's political opinions.

Professors hold their chairs up to the age of 65 in some, 67 in other universities, and in rarer Scottish cases, for life. Some institutions have separate staff associations to safeguard the legal rights of members but most staff members acknowledge the value of the National Association of University Teachers to which all university teachers and library staff can belong.

Formed after the first world war and run till well after the second by voluntary labour, it acquired in the 1950s a permanent headquarters in London (now at Bremar House, Sale Place, London, W.2 (tel.: Paddington 1854), and a salaried secretariat to help it in the exercise of its right—to make direct representations to the University Grants Committee on matters of salary. Its biennial and peripatetic council meetings offer opportunities to discuss administrative, academic and tenurial questions or the reports of liaison committees it has set up with other professional associations. The general secretary of the A.U.T. is K. Urwin, MA DU.

Whereas the Association of University Teachers is limited to full-time teachers and research workers in institutions of university rank in the United Kingdom, the National Union of Students (N.U.S.), formed in 1922, is open to students in training and technical colleges in England and Wales. There is a separate National Union of Students in Scotland. As well as ventilating opinions on accommodation, curricula, discipline, health, maintenance and teaching (the order is purely alphabetical) the N.U.S. arranges travel concessions and helps to secure employment in the vacation.

There is also an annual conference of university convocations (C.U.C.). Adopting a constitution as a joint standing committee on 9 November, 1918, representatives of the convocations of Birmingham, Bristol, Durham, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield met together to discuss problems. Since most of these convocations had, and exercised, the right to nominate one or more members to their respective university councils, such conferences acquired importance and indeed a constitution as such on 9 May, 1953. To the original member institutions are now added Exeter, Hull, Leicester, London, Nottingham, Reading and Southampton. Meetings are not reported in the press.

D. *Finance.*

Today 90 per cent. of the capital cost and 70 per cent. of the current income of universities is provided by the state via the U.G.C. The first amounted to £60 million, the second to £99 million in 1964-65. Of the capital grants about 30 per cent. is for halls, unions and libraries.

The Committee of Public Accounts has, since 1948, been pressing the

Treasury to both regularise by statute the ad hoc system of university grants and to ensure that the Comptroller and Auditor-General examine their capital expenditure. In 1950 (4th Report p. 40) it argued that "information at present available to your committee does not enable them to form an opinion" as to whether university grants "are administered with due regard to economy". The Treasury opposed this pressure as "getting too near the right in the first place of the Comptroller and Auditor-General and... indeed of Parliament itself, to go behind the actual grants given to universities and raise questions about or criticize the academic policy of the university which lies behind them" (6th Report p. 6,471).

The first concession was the appointment of the Gater Committee by the U.G.C. as a result of whose report in 1956 stricter control of university expenditure was initiated. The methods used by universities in contracting and recording and controlling expenditure as recommended by the Gater committee (cmd. 9, H.M.S.O., 1956) were further refined by the Rucker committee (cmnd. 1235, 1960), and by the fifth report of the estimates committee (H.M.S.O., 1965). For since 1951-52, university grants have grown nearly tenfold. This increase convinced the estimates committee that a 'new examination' was required. The results of this 'new examination', published as the *Fifth Report from the Estimates Committee* (H.M.S.O. 1965), were a timely reminder that we have not yet willed the means for the end we have accepted. It also posed the further problems of getting value for money and of reorganizing the University Grants Committee so as to ensure greater efficiency and secure greater incentives towards economy.

In 1965-66 twelve and a half per cent.—£207 million—of all educational expenditure in the national budget was spent on Universities in Great Britain. This was more than double the percentage—6 per cent.—and more than five times the amount—£37—of ten years previously.

Hence the need for cost analysis techniques was recognized by the U.G.G. So it set up a working party in March, 1965 under its deputy chairman to which eight registrars and finance officers were invited. As a result it was decided to recommend that revised forms of return should be issued for the academic years 1965-66 designed to separate and quantify the cost of undergraduate teaching, the cost of postgraduate work and the cost of research by university staff. The recommendation was accepted by the U.G.C. and issued to universities.

A second costing exercise, this time between the D.E.S. and the U.G.C., resulted in the institution of a common standard of residential accommodation for Universities, C.A.T.'s and Colleges of Education. Based on the 'study-bedroom unit' this uniform scheme applied to all residential schemes programmed to start in 1965 and subsequent years.

The third costing exercise is taking place to see if the C.L.A.S.P. system of building schools is adaptable to university science and technology buildings. A fourth aims at establishing 'norms' for equipment allowances for such buildings, especially chemistry and engineering. A fifth, to cope with replacing obsolete scientific equipment, has been undertaken by the D.E.S., the U.G.C., the S.R.C. and the treasury.

Lastly, in July, 1966 a computer board under Professor B.H. Flowers was established to oversee the expenditure of £20 million to equip, build and operate new computers in British universities.

Translated from the French.

FRANCE

H. GAUTHIER

Deputy Rector, University of Paris.

A. *Division of authority within the university, and the decision-making mechanisms.*

1 and 2. *The division of responsibility (de facto or de jure) between the faculties or departments, and the central organs of the university; centralization or de-centralization of decision-making powers.*
The division of responsibility between the academic staff, the administrative staff, and, where applicable, non-academic governing bodies or boards.

From the point of view of National Education, France is divided into 23 Academies (some of them very recent creations) which comprise two or more "departments" and whose territorial limits correspond approximately to those of the areas of regional activity. This division, which dates from the Napoleonic regime, exists as a consequence of regional traditions, economic expansion, density of population and the needs of different regions.

The Academy embodies all the services of National Education and the majority (1), very often all the public and private educational establishments responsible to the Ministry of Education and located in its territory. The whole group of higher educational establishments of an Academy constitutes the University.

At the head of each Academy is the *Rector* (Rector of the Academy of..., not Rector of the University of...) who is the direct representative of the Minister.

The powers attributed to the Rector are considerable and are beyond enumeration. May it suffice to say that he is responsible for the func-

(1) Some establishments, namely in the Paris region, are directly dependent upon the Ministry, for example: the College of France, the School of Archives, the Practical School of Higher Studies, the Advanced Teacher Training Colleges of St. Cloud and Fontenay, etc.

tioning of all the establishments and services under his authority. As delegate of the Minister, he has power of decision in very many matters related to staff, students, buildings, examinations, finance... In recent years, we have seen in this respect a wide-scale move toward decentralization which is still going on: as a result, Rectors are progressively acquiring more powers, more responsibility ,more authority, and thus more prestige.

In carrying out his multiple tasks, the Rector is assisted by a number of technical advisors: Inspectors for the various specialisations and a very important administrative machine placed under the authority of a Secretary-General.

Universities, as has already been stated, are composed of the higher educational establishments located in the territory of the Academy. As a general rule, they incorporate in the first place the Faculties, of which there are at least two, (the Faculties of Law and Economics, Medecine, Science, Arts and Human Sciences, Pharmacy, and Theology at the University of Strasbourg—in the formal order corresponding to the chronological order of their foundation) and the University and Faculty Institutes, the Libraries, the Higher National Schools, University Colleges, and soon the University Institutes of Technology... Universities are public institutions endowed with civil status and financial autonomy. They have legal statutes and general regulations (the law of 10 July 1896 which established the modern universities; the decree of 21 July 1897 which determined their common constitution; and the decree of 21 July 1920 which defined their composition, favouring the creation of Institutes and Schools). Their administration is directed by the Rector, acting for the University Council of which he is the ex officio Chairman. The powers of the Rector, in effect, derive from the attributions of the University Council.

The University Council comprises the Deans of the Faculties, two professors elected by each Faculty and a small number of non-academic members appointed by the Council and selected among those interested in the life of the University. The size of the Council thus varies from 12 to 20 members, according to the university.

The Council deals with all matters bearing on the administration of the University. According to the issue involved, it either takes final decisions, or submits its deliberations for approval to the Minister; in addition, it may be called upon to give its advice or simply express its wishes. Lastly, it has disciplinary powers (recommendations where professors are concerned, decisions with respect to students).

Each University has its own budget. This budget, drawn up under income and expenditure, is first prepared by the Rector, then examined and endorsed by the University Council, and finally submitted to the Minister. It may not be put into effect until approved by the Minister. The accounts of the previous year are approved in the same way.

The State contributes extensively to the functioning of the University. It assumes responsibility for the salaries of the majority of the staff and, in addition, bears a very large share of operating costs and expenditure on building or repair, either by granting subventions to the University in the form of income for its budget, or by passing credits to the local Treasury officials for expenditure on investments and expensive equipment.

Basically the University budget comprises the State subventions to which reference has been made immediately above; student fees (enrolment, library, examinations, practical work) of which a proportion is

reserved for the Faculties; subventions from towns, departments, chambers of commerce, various bodies, individuals; the revenue from the University's own estate—this estate may either be accrued from investments made by the University or from donations and legacies (the interest on which has often been designated for some specific purpose); the proceeds of publication and miscellaneous receipts.

As the financial contribution made by the State to the functioning of universities is rising from year to year and as its financial control is increasing, the University no longer has the same independence it enjoyed in the Middle Ages.

The Rector authorizes budgetary payments, which are made by a Treasury official, appointed by the Minister of Finance with the approval of the Minister of Education.

The Rector of the Academy, therefore, in his capacity as Chairman of the University Council, directs the administration of the University in the name of the Council.

* * *

Each Faculty is, as has been seen, a part of the University. Like the latter, it has civil status and financial autonomy, a separate budget which must be submitted for the approval of the University Council, and the means to administer it.

At the head of the Faculty is the Dean, assisted by an assessor, (sometimes two) who is entrusted with its administration. The Dean represents the Faculty in all aspects of its civil and administrative activities. He manages its estate, prepares the budget, has charge of the organization of courses and examinations, and of general discipline. He continues his own teaching programme.

Like the Rector, he has an important administrative machine placed under the authority of a Secretary-General.

In the management of his Faculty, he is assisted by a Council of which he is Chairman, and which comprises all the titular professors. The Dean carries out the decisions taken by this Council with respect to the budget, the acceptance of donations and legacies, the use made of revenues, the vacancy of chairs, the recommendations for vacant professorships...

In addition, there is a Faculty Assembly which comprises, the titular professors and the other senior members of the academic staff. Its competence is basically restricted to academic matters.

To summarize, Rectors and Deans, with the support of the Councils over which they preside, have extensive powers; although these powers are growing as the policy of decentralization pursued by the Ministry is being implemented, they are being subjected to the increasing supervision of the Central Administration and Financial Control.

Professors participate in the administration only insofar as they vote in the Councils of which they are members. However, the heads of laboratories assume responsibility for the use made of funds which have been allocated to them by decanal decision. The members of the administrative staff only have executive powers since sole responsibility is vested in the Rectors and the Deans; in practice administrative authority may be delegated to them for the conduct of current business.

* * *

3. *Continuity, or the lack of it, in administrative authority, and, in particular, the length and nature of the terms of office of Rectors, Vice-Chancellors or Presidents, and of Deans.*

The Rector is appointed for an unlimited period of office by a Decree of the President of the Republic, taken at a meeting of the Council of Ministers, on the proposal of the Minister of Education. Rectors are the highest officials of the external services of National Education. They are selected among the titular professors of higher education, usually among the Deans.

The Dean is appointed for a renewable period of three years by the Minister of Education, on the double recommendation (restricted to titular professors) of the Faculty Assembly and the University Council. Each recommendation may only carry two names. The usual practice is for the University Council to endorse the recommendations of the Faculty Assembly, and for the Minister to select the first of the two candidates proposed.

* * *

B. *Relations between the University and*

1. *Public authorities.*

The Rector, since he is the representative of the Minister and is appointed by the President of the Republic, must carry into effect, personally and by delegation of his powers, the orders and directives which he receives from the Government and Ministry of Education. Nevertheless, he retains great administrative freedom and autonomy within the laws and regulations in force. The recent administrative reform has increased the authority of the Regional Prefects, certainly, and the National Education administration has not been left entirely untouched—but the measures of reform, in practice, affect only a very limited sphere (investment for institutions of primary and secondary education, for which Regional Prefects and Rectors work in close collaboration).

The French universities have always taken great care to defend the rights they have held since their creation. Apart from the magistrates, there are probably no officials in France who have more liberal attributions than the members of the academic staff. In primary and secondary education, the principle of neutrality obliges teachers to be somewhat cautious in expressing their personal opinions. A member of the academic staff has full freedom of thought and expression: he is subject to no inspection and may teach what he considers to be true in his discipline, regardless of the philosophical or political consequences of this truth.

The University's independence is again apparent in the procedure for the appointment of academic staff. Doubtless, these appointments are pronounced by the Minister. However, in the Sciences and the Arts, senior lecturers are selected from the aptitude lists drawn up by the Universities Consultative Committee. The "agrégés" of the Faculties of Law and Medecine are recruited by means of competitive examinations; in this way public educational institutions have the right of choice.

This system of co-option is even more rigorous when an appointment is made to a titular professorship. The Minister's choice must be made

from candidates who are recommended to him by the Faculty Council, on the one hand, and by the Consultative Committee, on the other. Once appointed, it is virtually impossible to deprive a professor of his chair. He may, of course, be subject to a disciplinary sanction for a serious misdemeanour: but he has very strong protective guarantees, since no disciplinary action can be taken until he has appeared before the University Council.

Lastly, the University's independence is further safeguarded by the inviolability of its precincts. The police, in particular, may intervene only when authorized to do so by the Rector or Dean.

To summarize, it may be said that the French University enjoys an independence unknown to other public services.

2. *Private bodies.*

No influence.

3. *Where relevant, the university or national educational system in general.*

Nothing to report.

C. *Selection, appointment, promotion and legal protection of the academic staff.*

The conditions for the selection and appointment of academic staff in higher education have already been described in a preceding paragraph.

The promotion of academic staff is made either by seniority or selection. Such promotion is pronounced by the Minister of Education on the recommendation of the University Consultative Committee.

D. *Finance and budget.*

This aspect of University administration has been dealt with in a preceding paragraph.

Conclusion.

Advantages and disadvantages of the system.

Conclusions concerning the university administrative system in France will be determined at the close of the meeting of experts, in the light of information brought forward and the opinions expressed there.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

R.A. Holden

Secretary, Yale University.

A. *Division of authority within the university and the decision-making mechanisms.*

Although Harvard intended to carry on the English tradition of resident-faculty control, there were insufficient resources and scholars available. As a result the official founders became the governing body as the Board of Overseers; at William and Mary, it was a Board of Visitors; at Yale, the President and Fellows (now known as the "Corporation")— all non-faculty members, except for the president. Such non-resident control, unique in university tradition, has persisted in most universities throughout America: private institutions have boards of trustees; parochial universities are usually responsible to their particular order; and state universities have their independent boards which are nevertheless dependent on their state legislatures for operating funds.

As a result of this non-resident control, the president, who was formerly the first among equals or spokesman for the faculty, became the representative of the governing board and a power in his own right. If busy trustees did not have the time or interest to assume responsibility when their confidence in the professors waned, they would naturally pass this on to the president. The president has also become the chairman of the senate (of professors) when it exists, and as such the two lines of power re-associate with the president to provide a nexus of both lines of power.

No sooner had the president assumed most university administration functions when in the late nineteenth century enrollments increased, and universities began their expansion. Administrators proliferated, and there was further delegation of authority. Areas for decision-making began to include: (1) educational and research programs; (2) faculty affairs; (3) student affairs; (4) external relations, i.e. alumni, legislative, and general public relations; (5) finance (operating and capital); and (6) development, including physical and financial.

1. *Trustess.*

Trustees are chosen by (1) direct appointment of the board in power, the state legislature, or the religious order involved, or (2) election by fellow alumni. Often boards are composed of a combination of the two; they range in total membership from seven to thirty-five, although a large board will usually have an executive committee of five to fifteen members who will meet at least once a month to pass on the most urgent business. Other committees common to most institutions are those on (1) educational policy; (2) finance and budget; (3) investment; (4) buildings and grounds. In many universities, academic matters are given little attention by trustees who feel that this is an area of exclusive faculty domain; recommendations for faculty appointments and educational programs invariably are given a "rubber stamp" approval. Yet boards do have the final authority and accountability on all matters, even though their special competence may be for the most part in business or financial affairs, as it should be if they are properly to complement the academic competence of the faculty.

2. *President.*

The president (sometimes called a chancellor) is presumably an educator of distinction, with qualities as an administrator and stateman. In practice he devotes 30% of his time to financial and fund-raising matters, 20% to public and alumni relations, 20% to general administration, 10% to problems of physical facilities, and 20% at the most to educational matters involving meetings with faculty and student representatives. Few presidents are in fact educational leaders of their campuses; their leadership is usually accomplished through financial leverage. Much of their influence in faculty and student affairs has waned, depending on the size of the university; they have abdicated most of these by necessity to deans and other administrators. They must spend much of their time with financial or development affairs, but their public statements, in speech or writing, determine significantly the posture that the institution shall have for the public and in the minds of significant constituencies.

The president really shares his responsibilities with the trustees on policy matters and with the faculty on educational programs and faculty selection. He has formal authority in all these matters, but in decision-making, he influences largely through his own good sense, suggestion, and tactful persuasion.

3. *Deans and Department Chairmen.*

The dean's role emerged in the nineteenth century from two sources: first, with the establishment of separate and relatively independent professional schools; and, secondly, as an aid to the president with responsibility for educational functions which the president could no longer perform (the office of dean of Harvard College was established in 1870). While a dean in a small college may be merely an assistant to the president, his influence and status grow in a larger institution with heavy responsibility for budgeting departmental funds and for the selection and promotion of faculty members. The dean is invariably a professor, one who is chosen for his proclivity for administration and potential for academic leadership.

Department chairmen are faculty members and only part-time administrators. They teach a third to half-time and are expected to maintain their scholarly productivity. Their influence and initiative in educa-

tional policy, personnel, and budgeting relate closely to the size of the institution and the consequent decentralization of administrative units. They usually rotate on a three-year basis (although many are reappointed), and as a result their decisions are made with the full collaboration of their senior colleagues. While department heads are looked to by the dean and president as their representative and channel of communication with the faculty, they remain basically faculty members in function and in loyalty. In many large universities the departmental structure is subdivided into directors of undergraduate studies and directors of graduate studies.

Three factors seriously handicap effective decision-making on the part of deans and department heads: (1) they are "in the middle" between the expectations of higher administration and the ideas of the faculty; (2) they must often make decisions about the competence of individual teachers with little knowledge or appreciation of their specialties; and (3) few are able to think comprehensively in terms of the needs and interests of all departments and all schools that constitute the university.

4. *The role of faculties in governance.*

There is always tension between administration and faculty. Teachers are restive everywhere about low salaries, heavy teaching loads, lack of research and secretarial assistance, burdensome committee work, inadequate office space and laboratory facilities, faculty promotion policies, administrative arbitrariness or vacillation, etc. They do not differ materially from other people in desiring higher pay, shorter hours, more job security, and better working conditions. What is at stake is the role faculties should play in university policy. There is naturally a trend for greater participation, and this is sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and other professional groups. Yet there is a limit to the feasible decentralization of authority: Faculty preference for "committee" management, innumerable group meetings which deal with minutiae and operational details, and other time-consuming procedures require more justification than the democratic feeling that everyone is entitled to have a hand in all policy matters. Teachers have a professional allegiance to knowledge and intellectual freedom which theoretically supercede their institutional loyalties, whereas administrators are organization-oriented and are in a better position to make prompt and efficacious decisions. At the same time faculty committees are consulted on most issues in well-run universities, but it is generally agreed that more deliberate and purposeful collaboration is still needed among trustees, academic officers, administrative officers, and faculty to bring about the most effective educational effort.

5. *Administrative Tenure.*

Traditionally presidential tenure in the United States has been for "life", although in the twentieth century this has come to mean the regular tenure of a faculty member with retirement according to the statutes of the university usually at age 65, 68 or 70. The fact is, many presidents become tired after a decade or even less, or they conclude they have contributed all they can during that period; many prove to themselves or their trustees that they are not equipped for the job; and many are simply asked to terminate their service. Accordingly, over fifty new American college and university presidents are inaugurated each year.

The tenure of a dean is usually five years and is renewable. That of the department chairman is likely to be three years, but a chairman does not frequently serve more than two terms.

B. *Relations between the university and public authorities, private bodies, and the national educational system.*

Implicit in a discussion of the external relations of a university is the fear that it may lose its identity either from loss of principle or from being too rigid in an era of rapid change. American universities have been criticized for their lack of clearly defined purposes, but one cannot generalize in the face of the variety and number of institutions—public and private, large and small, non-sectarian and denominational; there is no monolithic pattern. There are state universities and municipal universities, but no national university. Some institutions are church-related and some totally church-supported. Others began with purely technical curricula and now also offer wide programs in humanities and social sciences.

This report deals with the major universities which evolved in the nineteenth century (1) from privately endowed liberal arts colleges such as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton; (2) from the land-grant colleges created by the Morrill Act of 1862 such as the University of California (Berkeley), the University of Minnesota, and the University of Illinois; and (3) those which were created *de novo* such as Johns Hopkins, Chicago, and Stanford. Needless to say, there are also many which are a mixture of these groupings. All combine to some extent certain former rival conceptions: the traditional purposes of the liberal arts as represented by their undergraduate colleges, the utilitarian concept or service functions of the land-grant college, as indicated by the existence of their engineering schools, and the Germanic commitment to research as exemplified by their graduate schools. All are developing a uniformity of function and purpose in cooperation with each other, often independent of the aims of those who established them.

1. *Relations between the university and public authorities: The influence of governments.*

The first efforts at establishing an American system of higher learning took place at the state level, since the Constitution did not allocate educational responsibility to the federal government. Each state government influences university curricula (1) by its requirements for admission to practice and certification of lawyers, doctors, teachers, nurses, public accountants, etc., (2) by its financial support to state universities, and (3) by legislative pressures. There are now many positive measures being taken to coordinate colleges and universities within many of the states; these in turn can be alert that educational priorities are not subverted to political interests. Regional organizations, combining the efforts of several states, are also in being.

Contractual Research.

The federal government had initial influence in providing free land for the land-grant colleges in 1862. These were to teach agriculture and mechanical arts or engineering "without excluding other scientific and classical studies". In other words, they were to be comprehensive universities.

The second impact by the central government came with its support

of scientific research during World War II. Now this support is reaching into all areas of higher education, including the financing of scholarships and fellowships—which had their beginning after the War with the so-called "G.I. Bill of Rights". The result has been greatly improved research facilities, new equipment, and faculty benefits (such as summer salaries). The disadvantages include an imbalance created in favor of science departments, a neglect of teaching, the diversion of institutional funds for purposes of "matching" federal funds, and the potential inroads upon an institution's traditional role in decision-making. Once committed to an extensive program of contractual research, universities may find it difficult to reduce this activity, particularly when funds have been in many cases integrated in the annual budget. To offset the above disadvantages, it must also be said that the federal government has scrupulously attempted to avoid influencing the policies of any institution. It should also be added: (1) the National Foundation for the Humanities and the Arts was enacted into law in 1966 and will provide some of the same benefits for these fields that the National Science Foundation does for science; and (2) U.S. government moneys provided for science fellowships have made it possible to direct to students in the humanities and social sciences a higher proportion of other funds.

2. *Relations between the university and private bodies: Alumni influence.*

University graduates began their rise to a position of formal recognition and power in the 1860's, when several institutions instituted the system of election of alumni trustees on a term basis. In some cases alumni members constitute the entire board of trustees; in others, only a part.

The extraordinary financial support alumni give their universities each year sometimes amounts (in annual and capital gifts) to 10% of the total budget. To many givers this is license to wield some influence—or terminate their contributions if they do not like certain faculty beliefs or activities. Many resist changes in the landmarks and practices they looked back on with pleasure in their own days; this often applies to extracurricular affairs such athletics and fraternities. Universities are now trying to channel this interest into constructive areas; the alumni magazines devote considerable space to serious educational issues, and regional forums and alumni seminars at which the most impressive of the university's lecturers speak are providing the means by which graduates not only expand their enthusiasm and loyalty for "alma mater" but add a new dimension to their own intellectual development.

Corporate Donors.

In the past twenty years industry has begun to give large sums of money to universities—in addition to a substantial amount of research projects and scholarship funds, "matching" grants, and the like. Private institutions are usually favored over public ones, and the "prestige" ones receive the largest philanthropy. In 1964 eighteen institutions received nearly 45% of the total endowment funds.

Foundations.

Foundations, by means of carefully directed grants, serve as national planners, particularly in the private educational sector. They provide the "venture capital" that makes educational progress and innovation possible, and the advice of foundation officials helps to bring order and

standards into the academic community. There is always the danger, however, that the university applicant may tailor a project to what he thinks the foundation wants, rather than in the direction of his institution's academic interests.

Accreditation Agencies.

The external control of academic standards is predominantly a non-governmental process, carried out by six regional associations, by one state agency, by thirty national professional organizations (as well as those which have a legislative foundation like the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association). The influence of these organizations is much debated and often resented. They assist administrators in assessing their own faculties and in looking for support, but they are also accused of encouraging segmentation in a university, of reinforcing the status quo, and thus discouraging experimentation.

Miscellaneous Private Agencies.

Certain national agencies have been created to perform various functions that the universities could not perform individually and never were able to perform collectively. These include the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (faculty retirement program); the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service (testing of all students for admission to college and professional schools); Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Program and National Merit Scholarship Corporation (programs to recognize the national distribution of talent); and the Institute of International Education, the African-American Institute, and Education and World Affairs (concerned with the international aspects of higher education). All of these were organized and are run by boards beyond the control of universities.

3. *Relations between universities and the national educational system in general.*

The United States has no formalized, national system of higher education, but rather a congerie of institutions varying greatly in size and standards. This fact, together with the sheer number and multifarious functions of the private agencies mentioned in the previous section, suggests that American higher education is both underorganized and overorganized. The U.S. Office of Education does not shape policy; it is purely a fact-finding body whose authority has only recently been increased through its responsibility to distribute new federal funds.

Institutional independence and integrity permit freedom of thought and action, but they also can produce parochialism and resistance to change. American educators are beginning to realize that they need more interdependence and less divisiveness, more cooperation to solve problems common to all universities and less disjointed laissez-faire diffusion. No monolithic scheme is advocated, but instead inter-institutional arrangements which could provide more effective utilization of facilities, programs, and personnel. The alternative may be political interference at national or state levels.

Regional Cooperation.

Ad hoc cooperative organizations have grown up over the years and usually consist of one of the following groupings of institutions: (1) those which may be dissimilar but have geographic proximity and (2) similar

institutions which are spread over several states. The "Big Ten" is a group of midwestern universities which work together on common educational issues. Most of them are state institutions, but this organization involves no direct participation of public authorities. The "Ivy League" (the older eastern universities) is largely organized around intercollegiate athletics. More useful are the college associations where faculties and academic programs are shared. In 1966 the Compact for Education was established under the aegis of state governments in an effort to pool common interests and problems.

National Cooperation.

In response to demand for accreditation and standardization in admissions, the Association of American Universities was founded to establish some uniformity especially among graduate schools. This is an organization limited to universities presumably of the "first rank". There are also the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, and many others. The American Council on Education is an overall holding company for all special educational groups.

The federal government now has approximately eighty agencies which deal with institutions of higher learning in awarding research and development projects, making loans, and granting fellowships and scholarships. (Of the seven chief agencies, the one dispensing the least funds is the Office of Education.) There is no coordinating body either at the government level or at the university level. Every institution speaks for itself, and the lack of a national ministry of education with direct responsibility for all education leaves the government agencies free to develop improvements, while the states bear the burden of operating supervision.

No one wants to change the present pluralistic system of higher education. It is flexible, competitive, and productive. But more voluntary cooperation of all universities is indicated, and certain questions are still to be answered: what kind of decisions are best made by centralized authority and what by localized authority? In what respects is decentralization inefficient, and in what respects helpful? Is federal aid complicating decision-making?

C. *Selection, appointment, promotion and legal protection of the academic staff.*

Appointments are based on teaching and scholarly attributes. Although good teaching and research are not antithetical, research productivity and publication are usually given the higher evaluation in the assessment of a person's worth to his university; at the same time most surveys show that the faculty members who are considered the best teachers by their students are the most productive scholars in their fields.

The multiple functions expected of the professor are in part the result of the Harvard Reorganization of 1890 when the Faculty of Arts and Sciences was made responsible for all non-professional education from the freshman year through the Doctor of Philosophy degree, and the obligation for both teaching and research was placed on the same faculty members.

Because of the indeterminate structure of American universities the criteria for appointments and promotions are often vague and conflicting. The meaning of research and investigation is equivocal. However, promotion to the next rank —and eventual tenure —is achieved within a fixed

number of years if the faculty member lives up to his promise in the estimation of the senior men in his department of study. If not, his term runs out, and he is allowed to resign and seek a position elsewhere. This sifting process or so-called "up or out" rule, provides for a rotation of younger teachers and insures the standards of the institution; and from the individuals' point of view it usually results in a far more harmonious matching of personal talents with institutional purposes.

1. *Selection* is made usually from candidates who have completed almost all, if not all, their work for the Ph. D. degree. (A new degree is being established now at some U.S. Universities which will prepare its graduates for faculty positions without the necessity of spending the extra years in writing—and defending—a dissertation.) An aspiring teacher up to now has often had to wait till he is 28 or 30 before being gainfully employed in his profession, while doctors are often ready at 27, ministers at 25, and engineers at 22. Frequently of course a talented graduate student is given a parttime job as an "assistant in instruction" or a "reader" which provides useful apprenticeship, but it also delays the completion of his course work or dissertation.

Ironically enough the quality of a dissertation—the best current scholarly effort of which a young man is capable—rarely serves as a criterion for employment. One is hired for his repute, i.e. what those in his discipline or department think of him; his prestige is not a direct measure of productivity, but a composite of subjective opinion. He is also hired for his compatibility—he must "fit in".

2. *Appointment* and recruitement are handled in theory on an "open" or competitive basis, but in practice much of it is "closed" or preferential. Seldom is a job secured through a plain application, nor through advertising in the English system. Contacts are made most frequently at annual meetings of scholarly and scientific societies which have come to be a clearing house for older men and a "slave market" for hopeful graduate students. Here the student is exposed to department heads of other institutions and given the proper introduction by the senior men of his own department. The best graduate students often get positions at their own institutions.

In the case of appointments to more senior positions of people from the outside, several systems have been employed. The most objective is the Harvard method of an ad hoc committee of elder statesmen in the field from various institutions, including the president and dean as well as the appropriate senior professors from Harvard itself. This method is similarly employed by sending a selected list of candidates to a group of acknowledged leaders in the field asking for comparison on specific qualities. A great danger with such devices, however, is that such outside experts will never be inclined to give away their best colleagues to a sister institution. But the greatest limiting condition at any university is the acquaintance in the professional field possessed by its own staff members. Individual recommendations from outside also cannot be trusted without additional verification. Recommendations are no better than their authors, and weaker departments tend to get the rejected candidates of stronger ones.

Efforts by the best institutions include: (1) an appointment procedure which will furnish officials with evidence of ability and promise not dependent on the warmth of a recommendation; (2) some means of including in the survey of candidates most of the qualified persons in the country, irrespective of present position or geographic location; (3) an interview technique which will gather some clues on the desirable capacities of mind

and character; (4) and some real evidence of the candidates teaching effectiveness.

In practice the permanent officers (personnel with tenure) of university departments usually make a single nomination which the whole faculty, dean, and higher administration (through appointments committees) can then approve or veto.

3. *Promotions* in rank are made in order to reward effectiveness and improve morale. Naturally a commensurate increase in salary is involved. The hierarchy generally consists of four ranks: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Depending on the institution there are also certain ranks which precede that of instructor and occasionally an extraordinary rank higher than a (full) professor, known by various titles such as distinguished service professor, university professor, etc. There is also the lecturer, usually the title for someone on a term appointment, who is not a full-fledged member of the department. He may be a young man or an older man; he is often serving only part-time as a teacher, with perhaps administrative duties as his chief academic role. The title of lecturer is ideal for teachers not involved in research, rather than a special professional hierarchy which would inevitably become second-class.

The time in grade fluctuates: instructor (with Ph. D.) 3—5 years on annual appointment; assistant professor 4—6 years on term appointment; associate professor 5—10 years. Promotion to associate professor usually involves tenure, but not always. (A person appointed from outside the institution is often given a probationary term appointment without tenure until he has served several years and proved himself.) In most institutions it is maintained that tenure shall be granted only after at least ten years' service. The American Association of University Professors, however, is making a strong recommendation for seven years.

The turnover is obviously the highest in the instructor's grade. Turnover in general is more prevalent in the lesser universities than in the major ones where the faculty can seldom better themselves by moving to another university and where initial selection is more rigorous.

The assistant professor is an intermediate status. At the end of his second term the "up or out" process begins to operate; it is determined whether he shall be promoted to associate professor or advised to seek an appointment at another institution. It is rare that at this stage he would be asked to resign for unsatisfactory service; it is more likely that the institution has no "slots" or vacancies in the next rank at the time or that the individual represents a specialty within the department which is already represented by sufficient teaching staff. Furthermore most administrators feel that the existence of a faculty vacancy should be established on the basis of demonstrated need for a particular position, and not on the basis of automatic succession. When one achieves a tenure position as an associate professor, his remaining source of anxiety is that he will not prove adequate to be made a professor. If he does succeed in the final promotion the competitive pressure shifts to an urgency to live up to the expectation of his position.

4. *Legal protection* is provided a university's teaching staff through (1) tenure, and (2) the vague umbrella of academic freedom for all. Faculty members work under informal agreements and usually have no contracts; they look on tenure both as a means of job assurance and as a protective device. The American Association of University Professors has supported the job assurance interpretation, but it has not been effective in sanctioning

institutions which have not conformed to its regulations—it is a rare thing anyway for scholars or scientists to be displaced because of ideological beliefs. The influence of the American Federation of Teachers is handicapped by the fact that its membership consists of the junior and marginal men of the faculty, and its authority is limited, especially in the universities of standing.

Notwithstanding, few people in or out of the academic world would argue that academic freedom does not belong to the individual member of the faculty as an essential ingredient of his teaching and scholarly activity. As long as he is not guilty of moral turpitude or egregious bad taste, he is at will to speak and write as he believes. Laymen say that the privilege is often abused and that in no other business or profession does an individual receive such a "life appointment". Yet if tenure and academic freedom were abolished, there would be threats to intellectual independence from within and without that would affect the entire university and college structure and the consciences of thinking people everywhere.

D. *Finance and budget: origin of resources and ways in which they are distributed and used.*

Four major factors present economic problems for higher education: (1) the rise in prices or inflation; (2) expanding educational services; (3) the needs of enlarged and modernized capital plant; and (4) fluctuations in enrollment. Just as one of the main strengths of the American system depends on diversity of institutions, so their viability depends upon the diversity of income. Each institution seeks its own funds and even state and parochial institutions are not dependent on any single source of support; this insures stability as well as independence. These sources include student fees (an average of 45% of income in private universities; 25% in public); income from endowment (15% private, 2% public); private benefactions (10% private, 4% public); state and city governments (4% private, 50% public); federal government (20% private, 15% public); miscellaneous (6% private, 4% public). Students thus pay less than one half of the cost of their education at private universities even when they pay full tuition—and at least one third of the students receive some form of scholarship assistance. At state universities, they pay one quarter of the cost—and much of this income comes from out-of-state students; in-state students pay only nominal fees.

Borrowing and deficit financing are common, particularly when new educational programs and facilities are needed. Many feel that tuitions should be raised to pay for the actual costs involved. Those who cannot afford it would be urged to exploit long-term financing (as with a house or automobile) or seek government loans. Others say that increases might price the institutions out of existence or eliminate a bulk of the student body. Educational budgets at the major universities have increased 300—500% in the past twenty years, and experience has shown that the backlog of needs are so great in all divisions of an educational institution that expenditures maintain their relative relationships throughout periods of increasing income.

State governments recognize that their capacity to finance higher education is limited (in view of the fact that the federal government has largely preempted the income tax and the local governments property taxes); therefore more and more effort is being made to raise money privately

through alumni annual giving, "associates" and bequest programs, corporation donations, and capital fund-raising drives—the lifeblood of the private institutions. Institutions in thriving communities are frequently better supported than better known ones in less prosperous areas. They all have large staffs of alumni and "development" officers to man these programs, but the main impetus must always come from the president.

Interest of the federal government in higher education started in 1787 when some public lands were allotted for its use, but except for the areas of agriculture and military training, there was no continuing involvement until World War II. Federal aid for special projects is now being relied upon more and more, but it is not clear whether it is covering the indirect costs of such activities. It is definitely not reimbursing out-of-pocket local costs for the Reserve Officers Training Corps, international education programs, and other services. Some American educators sense that too much money is going to new ventures rather than to improvement and strengthening of present standards. One thing is certain, and that is that there has been no evidence of government "control" as a condition of this support, as was once feared. Hostility to federal funds for universities is disappearing as everyone begins to realize that it is a constructive partnership that benefits both sides, provided that academic functions are not abdicated to the government.

Distribution and use of funds.

Plant. Old and poorly integrated campus plants present serious maintenance problems, and deferral of upkeep ultimately means increasing costs. The size of the institution has relatively little effect. The complexity of the campus rather than student enrollment governs these costs which may be in the neighborhood of 15—20% of a total university budget. This is increased if dining hall operations are involved.

Library and museums. Collections, especially the library, have become a critical asset and receive 5—10% of budgeted funds.

General administration. There has been a tendency to proliferate university administrations. Most staffs have quadrupled in the last twenty years, not only because of increased enrollments, but because of new functions and services. The percentage of the budget which goes to administration is larger at smaller institutions, since there is a minimum commitment regardless of the institution's size: 10—15%.

Scholarships and fellowships. Private institutions favor increasing student aid because they can then increase tuition; public institutions oppose them because scholarships increase costs and reduce the competitive advantage of state and municipal universities in attracting able students. As a result, subsidies vary greatly. On the graduate level, however, many public universities provide as much as or more aid than private institutions: 5-10%.

Research. Although the commitment of a few universities to extensive scientific research would increase this figure greatly, the average budgetary assignment is 20-30%.

Faculty salaries. Professors have traditionally been underpaid and until recently seemed to accept this exploitation. President Eliot of Harvard made it a national virtue: "luxury and learning are ill bedfellows". The founding of the American Association of University Professors in 1915 heralded a new day, however, and salaries have risen considerably, although not commensurately with the cost of living. This is

the result of many competing claims on a university treasury, the large needs for capital, the tendency of non-academic salaries to rise more quickly, and the large growth of fringe departments and additional staff needs. However, it should be said that with the large expansion of enrollment the average age of the faculty is declining and, under pressure of high demand, promotions are accelerating; accordingly at the same age or the same distribution by ranks, pay has increased somewhat more than the statistics would show. Across-the-board increases in salary are common during inflationary periods or when a new scale goes into effect, and raises based on merit are made at frequent intervals. Salaries take 15–20% of a university's budget.

Fringe benefits are expanding and are sometimes provided in lieu of salary increases. These include group life insurance, hospitalization and medical insurance, subsidies for children's college education, etc. Teaching loads are being slightly reduced, and outside work of a consulting nature is possible where it is related to and contributes to the faculty member's scholarly field.

Faculty members themselves could better their lot if they were to insist on an elimination in the wide variety of courses and thus reduce the number of teachers required. Of necessity most institutions today accept the fact of larger classes, more independent work, and less formal requirements — and the resultant higher student-teacher ratio. Student population has doubled in fifteen years, and there are simply not enough teachers available (or funds to pay them, if they were available) to staff universities with the very low student-teacher ratio that was traditional in the early part of this century.

Translated from the German.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

R. REINHARDT

Director, Institute of Commercial and Financial Law, University of Marburg.

The IAU, in the context of a comparative study, has asked me to prepare a descriptive report on the system of university administration in the Federal Republic of Germany. In order to define the scope of this, the following clarifications are needed:

According to terminology current in Germany, the term *Hochschule* (institution of higher education) refers to the following types of institution:

—universities, technical universities *(Technische Hochschulen)* and other university institutions *(Wissenschaftliche Hochschulen)* of equivalent rank;

—state and private institutions of higher education in philosophy and theology, and ecclesiastical colleges;

—higher teacher training colleges;

—academies of art, music and physical education.

The basic pattern for the university institution *(Wissenschaftliche Hochschule)* is constituted by the university itself. A publication edited by the Secretariat of the Conference of Ministers of Education, in collaboration with the Secretariat of the West German Rectors' Conference, and entitled *Das Hochschulwesen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland—Stand* 1965 (Higher Education in the Federal Republic of Germany—situation 1965) defines in the following way the characteristics of this type of establishment:

1. "the unity of teaching and research which today means the combination of a research function, that is marked by a high degree of specialization and can be carried out only through the collaboration of many persons and the use of costly equipment, with the task of preparing a rapidly growing number of young people for their responsibilities in a society which can now solve its problems only with the help of science;

2. the freedom of teaching and research from political and other ideological bonds—with the special feature that, while the State establishes, maintains and supports the institutions of higher education, it also refrains from interfering in their internal affairs, whose management remains the

responsibility of autonomous academic bodies, and that thus, between state and university, there is created a tonic and co-operative relationship facilitating flexible practical arrangements;

3. academic freedom which includes the freedom of learning for students, who are not—like schoolchildren— required to follow a prescribed course of day to day obligatory tasks and prove their progress in annual examinations, but are expected themselves to plan and carry out studies on their own responsibility. Study and examination regulations do to some extent limit the scope of such freedom—in varying degree from one discipline to another—but they do not affect the principle of the individual responsibility of each and every student."

The traditional characteristics of the university as a place of teaching and free research include, as marks of its autonomy: the right to award doctorates and the "Habilitation" (the *venia legendi* in higher education); the constitutional status of the rectorate; the right to make recommendations for appointments to vacant teaching posts. Legal recognition as a *Wissenschaftliche Hochschule* (university institution), in accordance with the principle of the sovereignty of the *Länder* in matters of education and culture, is conferred by legislative or administrative act of the *Land* in which the institution concerned is situated. In conformity with an agreement reached between the West German Rectors' Conference and the Conference of Ministers of Education, the existing university institutions are consulted as part of the procedure for the "recognition" of new institutions.

The outline that follows is limited to this type of university institution, to which the *Technische Hochschulen* also belong. The latter today would like to be referred to as "universities with a technological emphasis", and some, like the one in Berlin, already have the title "university" *(Technische Universität)*.

The essential legal bases for the organization of university institutions are the constitutional law of the Federal Republic of Germany and the constitutions of the *Länder*. These guarantee the freedom of teaching and research and, as a corollary, the autonomy of university institutions. Article 5, para. 3, of the constitutional law states:

"Art and science, research and teaching are free. Academic freedom grants no exemption from loyalty to the Constitution."

As an example of corresponding legislation to be found in the constitutions of the *Länder*, the Constitution of Baden-Württemberg, may be cited:

"The university institution has freedom of teaching and research. Without prejudice to control by the State, the institution enjoys an autonomy in line with its particular nature, in the context of existing legislation and of statutory provisions recognized by the State. It participates in the recruitment of teaching staff by exercising its right to make recommendations."

On the other hand, it is the State that furnishes the required *human and material resources* for teaching and research, and meets the financial needs of university institutions through its budget. The State thus bears the responsibility for maintaining the German universities. Through this, the State acquires possibilities of influencing the course of both teaching and research, which sometimes make its relationship with academic autonomy appear problematic. Concern for transforming this tense relationship into fruitful co-operation largely dominates current organizational questions of university reform in the Federal Republic.

In contrast to a complete separation of state and university competences (the Prussian curatorial system), efforts are being made to find solutions through which university autonomy would also include rights of participation in decisions concerning the budget, financial management and staffing questions. This concern leads, in particular, to an elaboration of new forms of internal university organization and a new division of responsibilities between its organs.

At present, higher education in Germany shows a juxtaposition of various forms of relationship between state administration and autonomous university administration.

At one extreme, there is the Prussian curatorial system—still in operation at Göttingen, Kiel and Münster—which entrusts the curator, as a state authority, with the administration of finances and personnel. The other extreme is presented by the Free and Technical Universities of Berlin and the University of the Saar. In these cases, the state limits itself to the allocation of a block grant whose distribution and management are left to the university acting in accordance with State budgetary regulations. The university is also recognized as the employer of its teaching and other staff—which is not usually the case.

Between these two extremes, there lie a number of systems in which the university itself is in a position to exercise effective initiative to the extent that financial and personnel management are undertaken by the university *on behalf of the State*, which then, in principle, limits itself to general directives. An example of such a co-operative arrangement is provided by the Hessian Law on Higher Education of 16 May, 1966. However, before one can go into greater detail on the forms of such co-operation and the distribution of corresponding responsibilities within the university, one must take a look at autonomous university administration. In this respect the first question before us is:

(a) (i) *Division of responsibility (de facto or de jure) between the faculties or departments, and the central organs of the university; centralization or decentralization of decision-making powers.*

On this question, the following comments are to be made: as a consequence of the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research and teaching, the first task of academic autonomy is the self-governed organization of the university's academic life. The scope of academic autonomy therefore includes all questions directly related to research and teaching—and in particular the election and establishment of university organs; the organization of teaching, with due regard for the regulations of State examinations; the formulation of academic examination regulations (i.e., doctoral and "Habilitation" requirements); the right to make recommendations for university staff appointments and to collaborate in the nomination of holders of chairs; the supervision of future university staff recruitment and the selection of scientific and technical assistants; the enrolment and expulsion of students as well as the maintenance of academic order within the university, including disciplinary regulations; the award of academic degrees and titles; and finally, certain consultative and advisory rights concerning the university's organization into faculties and departments, institutes and other similar structural divisions—though this enumeration cannot be considered exhaustive.

The structure of organs entrusted with the implementation of these

autonomous tasks differs considerably between one university and another, sometimes even within the same *Land*. This is true not only with regard to the competence of the organs, but also in relation to their composition and even their nature and the method of constituting their membership. Nevertheless, in general, the following organs are to be found: Rector and Senate ("full" and "restricted"), Dean and Faculty (including a "full" and a "restricted" faculty).

The Faculties.

The system of university administration in Germany is traditionally based on the principle of decentralization. The faculty is the essential autonomous administrative unit. It forms the centre of gravity for academic self-administration. It is in the faculties that the real task of the university is performed—the promotion of teaching and research.

The faculties are "component corporations" of the university—i.e., corporately organized parts of the university institution as a whole. While they possess no legal personality of their own, they do have the kind of competence, in certain fields, which enables them to exercise university rights independently—for instance the right to award doctorates.

The faculty is composed of the totality of its teachers, their officially appointed academic assistants and the students enrolled. Regular professors *(planmässige Professoren)* can in certain cases, with the joint agreement of the faculties concerned, be members of two faculties.

Organs of the Faculty.

The faculties normally have three organs: the "full" faculty *(weitere Fakultät)*, the "restricted" faculty *(engere Fakultät)* and the Dean.

A. *The "full" faculty* (called faculty council in Freiburg and faculty assembly in Aachen) comprises all teachers who are members of the faculty —i.e., in addition to holders of chairs (ordinary and extraordinary professors), all honorary professors, associate professors *(ausserplanmässige Professoren)*, private lecturers *(Privatdozenten)*, including those who as "auxiliary professors" *(wissenschaftliche Räte)* and as lecturers *(Dozenten)* have official civil service status (cf. in particular, Article 55 of the Münster Statutes).

The "full" faculty has the task of reviewing and making recommendations on questions relating to the status of teaching staff as well as general matters of instruction and the organization of courses, and in particular on the formulation or modification of faculty statutes and on regulations for the doctorate or the "Habilitation" (cf. Article 49 of the Bonn Statutes).

B. *The "restricted" faculty* (called faculty council in Stuttgart and faculty delegation at the Technical University of Berlin) is, with the Rector and the Senate, the most important element in autonomous academic administration. It is composed of ordinary and extraordinary professors and some elected representatives of "auxiliary professors" *(wissenschaftliche Räte)*, associate professors *(ausserplanmässige Professoren)* and lecturers *(Dozenten)*. Assistants and students are also represented in varying strength according to the relevant laws and statutes. In general, student participation is limited to student affairs. According to the Hessian Law on Higher Education, they take part neither in deliberations nor in voting on matters concerning academic staff appointments, "Habilitation", award of doctorates, other examinations, honorary degrees, and personal affairs of members of the teaching staff or their other academic colleagues.

The "restricted" faculty is competent to deal with all matters that are not explicitly reserved for the Dean or the "full" faculty. It is its special responsibility to look after research and teaching within its own field—it sets up programmes of study and controls their full implementation. It organizes preliminary and final examinations *(Vor- und Hauptprüfungen)* in its relevant disciplines and awards academic degrees, in particular the doctorate and "Habilitation", for which it also sets requirements. It exercises the right to co-opt members by preparing a list of candidates for appointments to vacant chairs; it has the right to make proposals for the nomination of honorary and associate professors, and for the allocation or abrogation of teaching responsibilities.

C. *The Dean* directs the current work of the faculty with the help of his predecessor, the "Pro-Dean" and, where foreseen, also the "Dean designate".

He is elected by the "restricted" faculty from among the ordinary professors, normally for a period of one year. At the Technical Universities of Karlsruhe and Stuttgart, however, the period is of two years—and at the newly established University of Konstanz, of three years. The Dean acts as the external representative of the faculty, chairs both the "restricted" and the "full" faculty, calls their meetings, formulates their decisions and carries them out. He awards doctorates and the "Habilitation". He maintains the internal order of the faculty and, in given cases, ensures that the teaching staff fulfils its duties regularly (cf., in particular, Article 16 of the Hessian Law on Higher Education).

Proposals for Reform.

In view of internal differences between the traditional faculties—which many consider far too large, too complex and arbitrarily limited and rigid—the Academic Council *(Wissenschaftsrat)*, has, in its "Recommendations on the Structure of New Universities" *(Anregungen zur Gestalt neuer Hochschulen)*, undertaken a review of the traditional faculty structure. The Council is composed of 39 representatives from the Federal Government, the *Länder* and the universities, and its mission is to "prepare an overall plan for the advancement of all disciplines of knowledge". It envisages three possibilities. The faculties could, to begin with, be partitioned into different specialized divisions *(Fachgruppen)*, which would send elected representatives to the "restricted" faculty, thus giving it the character of a faculty committee. Secondly, the faculties could free themselves from a great many current autonomous administrative responsibilities by delegating these to specialized commissions or groups, and therewith also give representatives of the middle ranks *(Mittelbau)* of the teaching staff (whose definition in particular instances is far from easy) the opportunity of participating in deliberations concerning studies and examinations. Finally, the complete abolition of the faculty system could be envisaged, with its replacement by a system of considerably more numerous divisions. The advantages advanced for this system include the greater internal coherence of such divisions, the possibility of giving non-professorial staff the opportunity to participate in administrative work and the strengthening of the central organs of the university, whose authority would indeed grow in proportion to the increased number of divisions established.

Similar formulae, it may be noted, have already been introduced in anticipation of this in the technical universities. A particularly instruc-

tive example of this is to be found in the 1960 Statutes of the Technical University of Aachen, whose faculties have in fact been subdivided into specialized divisions. Just as the faculty comprises "full" and "restricted" faculties with the Dean as executive head, the division comprises a "restricted" division, and a divisional assembly with the Divisional Director as executive head (Article 33 of the Aachen Statutes). The "restricted" division is composed of regular professors and of elected representatives of associate professors, private lecturers *(Privatdozenten)*, "auxiliary professors" and lecturers *(Dozenten)* (Article 35 of the Aachen Statutes).

The divisional assembly is composed of members of the "restricted" division as well as other members of the teaching staff—honorary professors, professors attached to research institutes, associate professors, private lecturers, "auxiliary professors", and lecturers (Article 40 of the Aachen Statutes).

Responsibilities are shared between the faculty and its divisions in such a way that—without prejudice to the faculty's right of review—the divisions, within their own areas of competence, take charge of matters relating to courses and instructional programmes, establish examination regulations, and conduct preliminary and final examinations in their fields. The "restricted" faculty, for its part, gives its views on the courses and examination regulations before passing them on to the Senate; confers academic qualifications on the basis of examinations held by the divisions, and confers doctors' degrees and the "Habilitation" (Articles 36, 37 of the Aachen Statutes).

Central organs of the university.

All university statutes make essentially similar provisions for central academic organs: a Rector and a Senate ("restricted" and "full"). The relationship between the central organs and the faculties is traditionally one of co-ordination (not subordination) in accordance with the principle of decentralization. This is not contradicted by the fact that various university statutes designate the Senate as the supreme governing body in matters of academic self-administration. This means to say, in fact, that even the actual responsibility for the overall administration of the university is oriented not autocractically but in a collegiate spirit. The Senate cannot give any instructions to the faculties, nor may it act as a court of appeal against faculty decisions. On the other hand, the Senate, too, is not subordinate to the faculties.

The "Restricted" Senate.

(In the following briefly referred to as "the Senate".)

Its composition is not always the same. In general, its officers include the Rector, the Pro-Rector, the elected future Rector *(Rector designatus)* and the Deans or their representatives. In addition, its membership normally includes elected senators *(Wahlsenatoren)* appointed for two-year terms by the "restricted" faculties and other senators elected by the totality of the non-titular teaching staff—"auxiliary professors", associate professors, lecturers and private lecturers. Representatives of students also take part in its sessions with voting rights. The scope of such student participation is subject to varying regulations in different institutions (see "The Faculties", above). The Rector chairs meetings of the Senate, which he calls at least once every semester after drawing up the agenda. The Senate deliberates on all general questions of autonomous academic administra-

tion insofar as these have not, by law or statute, been entrusted to other bodies. It makes policy decisions for academic administration and concerns itself with the co-ordination and co-operation of the faculties.

The "Full" Senate.

Side by side with the "restricted" Senate, German universities have an additional central organ in the "full" Senate which has varying responsibilities and names (Convention in Münster; Grand Council in Aachen and Karlsruhe; Plenum in Freiburg; Council in Göttingen, and Consistory in Kiel). The "full" Senate normally comprises all regular professors and in addition "auxiliary professors", associate professors, *Privatdozenten* or *Dozenten* and their representatives elected by the "restricted" faculty or the Senate. The statutes of the former Prussian universities further stipulate that the number of non-titular university teachers to be elected to the "full" Senate should equal half the number of members who hold chairs. Representation for assistants and students is also foreseen.

The Rector acts as the chairman of the "full" Senate, and calls upon it to meet whenever this is considered necessary. The functions of the "full" Senate include the election of the Rector; the modification, if necessary, of the university statutes; decision on matters referred to it by the "restricted" Senate; and the nomination of honorary senators and honorary "citizens" of the university. It also expresses its views on major general issues for higher education.

Finally, mention should also be made of a third academic organ envisaged in the statutes of many universities: the General Assembly—or the General Assembly of University Teachers—which is composed of all members of the teaching staff and which is called together from time to time, in order to maintain the unity of the university and to strengthen the links between its members.

The Rector.

The Rector is elected from among ordinary professors, including those who do not hold chairs, by the "full" Senate or by a corresponding organ.

His election requires ratification from the Ministry of Education. The right of ratification is part of the legal right of control of the Minister. Ratification may thus be refused in cases where legal objections can be raised (cf., in particular, Article 50, para. 9, of the Statutes of the University of Frankfurt-am-Main). The new Statutes of the University of Münster, however, no longer maintain a right of ratification by the Minister, but simply an obligation on the part of the University to notify him. This formula can be considered legitimate in institutions where the curatorial system is in force. How far it can be applied in cases where financial administration is entrusted to the university still requires further clarification. Even then, however, the State's rights should, in principle, be limited to that of legal control.

The Rector represents the university and, together with the Senate, supervises co-operation between the university organs as well as that between the teaching staff and students. As a corollary of this, the Hessian Law on Higher Education gives the Rector the right of access to and participation in all meetings of faculties and committees, including those of students committees.

The Rector represents the university in its external relations and directs

the current business of academic administration. Normally his predecessor, the Pro-Rector, deputizes for him.

The Rector administers the university in accordance with its internal regulations. These in particular govern the use and allocation of buildings, the maintenance of public order in the university precincts, insofar as such questions are not entirely matters of financial administration. He is also generally responsible for the maintenance of academic discipline.

(a) (ii) *The division of responsibility between the academic staff, the administrative staff, and, where applicable, non-academic governing bodies or boards.*

The principles governing the relationships between academic administration and financial and staff management have already been dealt with at the beginning of this report. Here then, all that remains to be done is to give a more detailed account of the mutual relationships between the teaching staff, academic administration, and financial management

"Monocratic" Curatorial System.

At the Universities of Göttingen, Kiel and Münster, it is the Curator who, as permanent representative of the Minister within the university, is responsible for financial and staff management. The Curator is not an intermediary between the university and the ministry; he is the Minister's resident delegate at the university.

The example of the University of Münster can be used to give a brief outline of how, in such a case, university influence on administration can be assured: According to Article 5, para. 2 of its Statutes, the Curator and his deputy are appointed and withdrawn on the recommendation of the Senate, in conformity with normal procedures of the Civil Service Law. Furthermore, in order to overcome the dualism between academic and State administration, the Statutes provide for a co-ordinating committee. The responsibilities of this committee particularly involve reaching agreements with the Curator on budgetary previsions: on the allocation of financial and other material resources; on the acquisition and sale of real estate; on the planning of buildings—and in a general way, on the development of the university and other important questions.

Collegiate Curatorial System.

This system is typical of "endowed" universities *(Stiftungsuniversitäten)*, e.g., at Cologne and Frankfurt-am-Main. The Curatorial Council at these institutions is composed of their founders, representatives of the municipality, representatives of the State and of the university itself.

New types of Curatorial Councils are to be found at the Free and Technical Universities of Berlin and at the University of the Saar (where the Curatorial Council is called the University Council). These Councils give a large measure of independence to the university in its financial affairs.

In Berlin, the Curatorial Council is composed of:

a) the Mayor, as chairman, and the "senators" responsible for public education, finance and home affairs;

b) the President of the Chamber of Deputies and three other representatives of the community nominated by the Chamber of Deputies;

c) the Rector, the Pro-Rector and two other members of the academic staff;

d) one representative of the students;

e) three persons proposed by the Rector, and representing branches of activity corresponding to disciplines taught at the university;

f) a personality chosen by the Curatorial Council and who has the necessary training for a career in law or the higher levels of administration.

The Curatorial Council establishes regulations for its own financial administration, supervises their implementation and decides on questions of financial concern, particularly those involving budgetary previsions, the planning of buildings and new constructions, and important matters of estate holdings and finance.

The composition of the University Council of Saarbrücken is similar, but it includes an even stronger representation of the academic staff.

The current business of financial administration at Saarbrücken is dealt with by the Rector with the assistance of the administrative committee of the Senate whose membership, includes the Rector, the Pro-Rector, the Director of Administration and one representative from each of the faculties. In Berlin these functions are discharged by the Curator.

Administrative Committees.

In the Bavarian universities—for which the University of Munich is taken as an illustration—past endeavours have been directed toward integrating the academic and financial administrations, entrusting the latter to an administrative committee which worked side by side with the Senate, but on its own responsibility.

A collegiate organ, the committee was composed of the Rector, as chairman, and four ordinary professors elected by the Senate for a period of four years. Its competence, in particular, covered management of the University's own resources; preparation of the budget and supervision of its implementation; control of the accounts, etc. This arrangement, it appears, has not proved satisfactory, for it tended to overburden the academic staff without significantly improving administrative efficiency. Above all, in matters of staff and financial management, the lack of an administrative director was felt. This is why—partly also inspired by the example of the Technical University of Munich—the University itself decided in 1965 to establish the post of a Director of Administration called upon to assist the Rector in matters of academic as well as staff and financial administration. In this way, the University adopted the same basic concept that had already been put into the new Statutes of the University of Bonn and the Technical University of Aachen in 1960.

In this system, the Rector is fully in charge of academic affairs, but in matters of finance and academic staff, he is assisted by a Chancellor who has his own major responsibilities. The relationships between Rector and Chancellor were conceived somewhat in the manner of that between a Minister and his Secretary of State. But there is no doubt that this raises delicate problems. Since in administrative affairs, the Chancellor is more experienced and better informed than the Rector, he may easily come to occupy a dominant position, which creates a danger of dualism in university management. At Bonn and Aachen, efforts have been made to counterbalance this by giving extensive directive powers to the Rector. It is doubtful, however, whether this remedy has been quite satisfactory, because, as already pointed out, the Chancellor possesses far greater specialized knowledge in matters of financial and staff management.

Another solution to the problem, therefore, consists in not giving the Rector directive powers in financial and staff management, but, on the

contrary, relating the Chancellor more closely to the bodies in charge of academic self-government. In this respect an important role is played by a body that the Hessian Law has named the Administrative Council. This Council is chaired by the Rector, and its membership includes the Chancellor, several members of the teaching staff and one representative of the students. It reviews especially important questions of financial and staff management. Its decisions are formulated and executed by the Chancellor. The Chancellor has a right of veto on decisions that infringe the law or violate the principles of sound and economical administration.

In order to avoid the danger of dualism, it is foreseen that the Rector, as chairman of the Administrative Council, must ensure that financial and staff management conforms to the purposes of the university and remains in step with its academic administration. To characterize such co-operation, one refers to it as unified administration. The Hessian Law follows the basic lines of this concept and, it should be added, thus also those of the recommendations made by the Academic Council on the structure of new universities (*Anregungen zur Gestalt neuer Hochschulen*, 1962, p. 23).

(a) (iii) *Continuity, or the lack of it, in administrative authority, and, in particular, the length and nature of the terms of office of Rectors, Vice-Chancellors or Presidents, and of Deans.*

The question of continuity, or its lack, can be answered only if one takes account of the overall organization of the university.

In the traditional Rectoral system, the element of continuity was not very marked. Continuity was, in fact, represented only by the Curator, who was not an organ of the university, but of the State. In comparison with his period of tenure, the Rector's right to re-election and the two-year mandate of members elected to the Senate could play no more than a feeble role.

New developments and, in particular, the tendency toward strengthening self-administration have given increased importance to continuity within the university's own organization.

The university's position in modern society, the need for it to affirm this more energetically, its fuller participation in decisions concerning the whole of higher education, all make continuity more essential, particularly at the level of the university's central organs. The extension of the Rector's period of appointment therefore seems necessary, and this has in fact been provided for in the Hessian Law on Higher Education, according to which the Rector is to be elected for a minimum period of four years. However, the more such extension is prolonged, the more difficult it becomes for the Rector to keep up his research work. This combination of the responsibilities of Rector with active participation in academic work has always been a part of the German concept of the Rectoral system. Efforts have therefore been made to find a solution either in terms of appointing several Pro-Rectors to assist the four-year Rector, or of electing a Directorate to head the university as a collegiate organ composed of at least three members elected for three years, thus permitting a certain division of labour. Responsibility for representing the university, in this case, is borne in rotation for one year by each one of the three Directorate members, who, during this period, is called the Rector in office, while his colleagues are designated Co-Rectors. Continuity is here assured by the fact that each year only one of the three members leaves the Directorate to be replaced by another.

In the context of the Hessian Law on Higher Education, it should also be noted that the Administrative Council, mentioned earlier, forms another element of continuity. The statutorily fixed mandates of its members is envisaged as extending over a period of three or four years. In addition, entry to the Council and the termination of the mandate will also follow a rotational system. With such a p. vision, university statutes fulfil the fundamental requirement of Article 9 of the Hessian Law, which in a very general way stipulates that the statutes of each university shall "assure an adequate continuity in administration".

Finally, there is marked continuity in the person of the Chancellor, who, except in special circumstances, is appointed for an indefinite period, which, however, does not exclude the possibility that his appointment may on occasion be made for a limited term.

In the interest of continuity, the Hessian Law also envisages the possibility of combining the responsibilities of Rector and Chancellor in those of a President whose appointment would extend for eight years, and in the case of immediate renomination, would be prolonged for another twelve years. The University of Konstanz now has a President appointed for life (i.e., until the age of retirement) although the title of Rector has been retained.

If the universities themselves view this development with some doubt, it is because what is important to them is not mere continuity as such, but a genuine academic continuity, which, in other words, is based on direct contact with the tasks of research and teaching. There are thus some fears that, with the adoption of the presidential system, academic self-administration may be subjected to undesirable changes. And above all, one must ask whether a President with such great powers is really appropriate in a university system where the State meets the necessary material requirements of the universities, and where these do not have to concern themselves with raising funds among the wider community and making decisions on how to use them.

For the sake of continuity, recommendations for extending the tenure of Deans have also been made. The University of Konstanz has extended the tenure of Deans to three years, even though it had already diverted to other bodies a number of tasks previously the responsibility of faculties.

The Hessian Law limits itself to stipulating that the Dean, with the help of the "Pro-Dean" and the Dean designate, shall conduct all current business of the faculty. This means that, in practice, every Dean takes part in the direction of the faculty for two years.

(b) (i) *Relations between the university and public authorities (central and local governments, etc.).*

As a result of their right to self-administration, German universities possess a legal personality; they are corporations in public law, even though the State finances them through its own budget and is responsible for their foundation. In this sense universities may be referred to as State institutions: many university constitutions and statutes use this expression, and there is no objection to it. As self-administered corporations, the universities are subject to State supervision. This, in matters of academic self-government, is limited to what is called legal control *(Rechtsaufsicht)*—i.e., the State limits its control to ensuring that the universities fulfil their given tasks in accordance with the law and their own statutes.

Insofar as financial and staff management is also entrusted to the university (see above, p. 4), this is carried out only as a delegated responsibility. It is thus, in principle, subject to control of such management; but this control must, nevertheless, leave sufficient latitude to university organs and it can be exercised—if at all effectively—only through directives of a general kind (cf. Article 3 of the Hessian Law).

(b) (ii) *Relations between the university and private bodies.*

Relations between the university and private bodies, in practice, are not of particular significance.

Article 138 of the Bavarian Constitution, however, does provide for the possibility of setting up private institutions with the authorization of the State. According to Articles 45 ff. of the Saar University law, third persons may, with the agreement of the Ministry of Education, enter into contracts with the University and participate in setting up new chairs (endowed chairs) and institutes (endowed institutes). Furthermore, there are many promotional associations devoted to assisting one or other university institution.

(b) (iii) *Relations between the university and the university or national educational system in general.*

Universities are dedicated to research and teaching. Research clearly forms one of their most important and fundamental tasks; but through teaching, they must also prepare students for professions that require or benefit from academic studies. This training function is especially stressed by Article 2 of the Hessian Law on Higher Education.

Moreover, as far as possible, universities also concern themselves with the training of persons who are already active in professional life.

University entrance requirements are normally completed at a public or private (but State recognized) school over a total schooling period of thirteen years (of which four are spent in a primary school and nine in secondary school) terminated by the Higher School Examination (Abitur). In addition, each *Land* makes provisions which enable persons already engaged in professional work to obtain entrance to the university. There are no special university entrance examinations. For certain disciplines, the Minister of Education may approve certain other types of studies as equivalent to the university's entrance requirements.

(c) *Selection, appointment, promotion and legal protection of academic staff.*

In terms of their rights and duties, university teachers in the Federal Republic belong to different groupings within the university community.

Nuclei for the teaching staff are formed by the holders of chairs *(Ordinarien)*. Each faculty includes a series of chairs which assure an adequate coverage of the whole of its relevant academic discipline.

Alongside the ordinary professor, there is the extraordinary professor *(Extraordinarius)* who is usually responsible for a particular discipline and who enjoys most of the rights of the ordinary professor.

The private lecturer *(Privatdozent)* is a person who has secured the right to teach *(venia legendi)* by the *Habilitation*. Private lecturers may be temporarily appointed as civil servants, and are then called *Diätendozenten*. When they have acquired what is termed "professorial maturity" *(Lehr-*

stuhlreife) and this has been appropriately attested (as a rule after four to six years following the *Habilitation)*, they may, on the recommendation of the faculty, be appointed associate professors *(ausserplanmässige Professoren)*. In accordance with a recommendation of the Academic Council, a new post of "auxiliary professor" *(wissenschaftlicher Rat)* has been created in recent years, in general reserved for those lecturers *(Dozenten)* or associate professors who, on the recommendation of the faculty, are appointed civil servants for life. This post is above all envisaged for Directors of university divisions. More recently they have begun to be designated as "Divisional Head and Professor" *(Abteilungsvorsteher und Professor)* or "University Counsellor and Professor" *(wissenschaftlicher Rat und Professor)*. A current proposal under consideration is to call this type of professor "extraordinary" *(ausserordentlicher Professor)* in a new sense, and to reclassify the former extraordinary professors as ordinary professors.

The honorary professor *(Honorarprofessor)* generally exercices a profession outside the university. He is appointed by the Minister of Education on the recommendation of the faculty, and is responsible for a distinctly specialized discipline. He has neither the status of a civil servant nor that of a university employee. Certain teaching duties may also be assigned to persons who, in a given academic field, are in a position to enrich its teaching.

Assistance in the performance of teaching functions is also provided by academic counsellors *(akademische Räte)*, secondary school teachers attached to a university *(Studienräte im Hochschuldienst)*, instructors and "tutors" *(Kustoden)*. They do not need to possess the *Habilitation* title, and their teaching functions are above all preparatory.

Academic assistants *(wissenschaftliche Assistenten)* are attached to a department or institute. They help the professor in his teaching duties and research as well as carrying out their own research. It is from among them that a major proportion of future teaching and research staff emerges. These posts are essentially temporary.

The titular university teacher is a civil servant directly employed by the State (except in the Free and Technical Universities of Berlin, where the university is their employer as a legal corporation). However, their civil service obligations are considerably modified by the principle of freedom of research and teaching guaranteed to university teachers by the Constitution.

Side by side with his civil service status, the university teacher stands in a special relationship to the university as a self-governing corporation. This corporate link finds its expression in the right to take part in elections and to be elected to academic organs. There is, moreover, the duty to participate in university self-government.

The dual status of the university teacher also shows itself in the fact that while recommendations for appointments are submitted by the faculties, the appointments as such are made by the government. On this subject, it is perhaps interesting to note the following details.

What is important here is a balanced collaboration between the university and the State. The university first of all wishes to avoid the "allocation" of teachers by the Ministry. On the other hand, the ministries insist that recommendations for appointment should not be unduly delayed. Taking account of this situation, the Hessian Law on Higher Education provides detailed regulations (Article 26). It guarantees the faculties

with the possible participation of the Senate—the right to make recommendations. A list of recommendations must normally be submitted within a delay of six months. If this is not done, the Minister may appoint an "appropriately qualified person", after giving the faculty the opportunity to present its views. However, even in such a case, there remains the possibility of appointing another person to the post, following agreement with the faculty.

Another point to be noted is that when the Minister of Education has objections to a recommended appointment, he has the right to invite other recommendations and, where relevant, to appoint a person who has not been recommended by the faculty. But this happens only in exceptional and justified cases. The Minister must show that he has decisive reasons for not following the recommendations submitted to him.

The "allocation" of a university teacher by the Minister is only considered, therefore, as a last resort.

Similar formulae are likely to be adopted in the laws of other *Länder*.

The normal regulations for civil service careers do not apply to university teachers. The salary scales of the civil service form the framework within which the conditions of appointment are negotiated. Until the last few years, a teacher received "course fees" *(Kollegegelder)* according to the numbers attending his lectures. This system has now been replaced by fixed rates.

The university teacher enjoys legal protection as a public servant, but his obligations as such are limited by the right of freedom of research and teaching guaranteed by the Constitution. On the other hand, as a public servant, it is his duty to carry out his tasks of teaching and research appropriately.

The university's own organs have no right to issue directives to its teachers.

(d) *Finance and budget: origin of resources and ways in which they are distributed and used. Division of responsibility in financial and budgetary planning.*

Here the principle must be noted that the State furnishes the university with the necessary means for its operation. This can take the form of a block item in the State budget, which is the case with the Free and Technical Universities of Berlin and the University of the Saar. Here it is the university's responsibility, as a public corporation, to prepare a detailed draft budget for its income and expenditure. This highly responsible task, in the above-mentioned universities, is entrusted to the Curatorial Council, which includes representatives of the university, the Government and the Parliament. It is then Parliament's responsibility to decide whether or not to grant the requested funds. The implementation of the budget is the responsibility of a Curator, in Berlin, acting as a kind of executive officer for the Curatorial Council; and at Saarbrücken, of the Rector assisted by the Administrative Committee, the Senate and the Director of Administration.

In all other universities, the allocation of funds is directly inscribed in the State budget, under the chapter for the Ministry of Education. It is therefore the task of Parliament to fix the sums which will be allocated to different items of the university budget. Freedom in the utilization of such funds is thus strictly limited. It means that those receiving the funds —chairs, institutes, etc.—can decide which books or what apparatus it

would be most appropriate to acquire with the available funds. Payment orders are given by the Curator in the Curatorial system (e.g., at Göttingen and Münster) and by the Chancellor in the Chancellery system. However, even in this arrangement there is the possibility of obtaining block grants for certain special purposes—e.g., for expeditions and excursions. In these cases, the allocation of funds is the responsibility of competent bodies of the university, with a more than usually strong participation of the central organs of academic self-administration: the Senate or the Administrative Committee.

The Chancellor usually also has the function of "budget superintendent", which makes him especially responsible for the correct implementation of budgetary provisions.

Universities may also receive private donations, e.g., from foundations. Their utilization is the responsibility of the organs of self-government (see above).

(e) *The students.*

Attention has already been drawn to student participation in the university's organs of self-government; but no mention has yet been made of student self-government as such. All the students of a university are grouped together as members of the Student Union *(Studentenschaft)*, which is recognized as a self-governing corporation within the university. It thus has the right to formulate its own statutes. These statutes generally provide for the following organs of the Union: a "General Committee of Students" *(Allgemeiner Studentenausschuss.* ASTA), which represents it; the "Student Parliament"; an "Alumni Council" *(Aeltestenrat)*, and sometimes a General Assembly of Students. Among the tasks of student self-government, special mention may be made of the protection of its members' interests in relation to higher educational policy; the organization of student self-help; participation in other forms of student aid; the maintenance of international student relations and the development of university sport.

The Union is subdivided into Faculty Associations *(Fachschaften)* whose activities are carried out at the faculty level.

In recent years, the student unions have demanded a strengthening of their powers. This is justified in private law, because the accomplishment of the tasks of self-government requires the sanction of private law. Hessian Law goes beyond this and recognizes student unions as having the status of corporations in public law within the university. This status does not affect their position as member organisms of the university, because their aims and activities all arise from the tasks of the university as such.

The student unions of all the universities are grouped in the Federation of German Student Unions (*Verband Deutscher Studentenschaften*, VDS), which is subdivided into a series of Federations at the level of the *Länder*. From the legal point of view, the VDS is an association in civil law.

f) *Supra-Local Bodies* (1).

The university institutions have organized themselves at the level of each of the various "Länder" by setting up a Conference of Rectors of the Land

(1) This section was added after the meeting of the Working Party in order to make the paper more comparable in coverage with the others.

(Landesrektorenkonferenz). These bodies provide a framework for the rectors to deal with matters of common interest and the means of representing their interests collectively with their respective Ministers of Education (Kultusminister).

"Supra-regional co-operation between the autonomous governing bodies of the individual university institutions is carried out through The West German Rectors' Conference. This is a permanent body based on the free association of university institutions as autonomous academic corporations. It is composed of the West German Universities, Technical Universities and other university institutions which enjoy "rectorial" status and are empowered to confer doctorates and the "Habilitation"; each institution is represented by its rector. The organs of the West German Rectors' Conference are: the Plenary Assembly (Plenarversammlung) which meets twice a year; the Presidential Committee (Präsidialausschuss) comprising four elected members; and the Land Committee (Länderausschuss) composed of the chairmen of the Rectors' Conferences of the various Länder; and a President elected annually by the Plenary Assembly.

The purposes of the West German Rectors' Conference are to co-ordinate the autonomous activities of the university institutions and to deal with matters of teaching, research and academic training which are of common interest to its members. In particular, it is concerned with all questions related to university autonomy; it takes up matters of higher education in their pan-German context, and promotes international university co-operation. A number of specialized commissions have been set up to advise the various organs of the West-German Rectors' Conference, for example a commission on higher education legislation and a schools' committee. The member institutions, for their part, have delegated members of their senates (Senatsbeauftragte) to follow work in certain major fields such as international university co-operation, student housing, and university policy making machinery. They hold technical meetings within the framework of the Conference.

The West German Rectors' Conference works in close co-operation with the Federal authorities responsible for scientific development as well as with the Standing Conference of Ministers of Education of the Länder and its committee on higher education--particularly on matters affecting the exercise of academic autonomy and the administrative powers of the state.

Faculty meetings (Fakultätentagen), attended by the deans of the interested faculties, are held within the framework of the West German Rectors' Conference to discuss matters of concern to particular disciplines and the normalisation of faculty regulations". (From *Das Hochschulwesen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.)*

The German Association for Scientific Research (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) is a central body responsible for the promotion of the sciences. It is an autonomous and legally independent private corporation representing German science. Its members include, the university institutions, the scientific academies, the Max-Planck Society, and other national scientific institutions. Its purposes are to finance research, to co-ordinate research programmes, to advise the authorities on scientific matters, and to promote relations between German research and science in other countries. Half of its budget is provided by the Federal Government and half by the governments of the Länder.

The German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst) (DAAD) facilitates academic relations with other coun-

tries in the fields of study, teaching and research. It offers scholarships to foreign academic staff, young research workers and students; helps German scholars and students to travel abroad; and administers the Federal Government programme of exchanges of academic staff with other countries, particularly in Europe. The Service is a legally independent autonomous body and its members include the university institutions and their student associations.

Translated from the Spanish.

LATIN AMERICA

G.L. DE ROMERO BREST

Former Director, Institute of Education,
University of Buenos Aires.

A. *The Division of Responsibility, and Policy-making.*

Latin-American universities, in spite of their diversity, are in some respects—administration and management, structure, general outlook—strikingly similar. They are almost exclusively devoted to the training of students for the professions—and they are organized on the basis of faculties operating independently, unrelated to one another. Thus a university appears as a federation of faculties, having in common their budget and a higher-level board of trustees or governors. This traditional pattern of organization still prevails in the area, in spite of the new requirements of mass enrolment, the need to open up new careers, foster the teaching of fundamental sciences, develop scientific research, etc. Re-organization on the basis of departments, the division of teaching into "cycles" or levels—one common to all students and which would meet the purposes both of providing them with basic training and feeding them in to higher cycles of scientific or professional training—meets with stubborn resistance, to quote but one example. And this reluctance to abandon the traditional pattern of faculties appears not only in underdeveloped countries but also in those already well on their way to modernization.

Contrasting with the persistence of this particular pattern, there have been noteworthy changes in administration and management, which started in the late twenties along with the student movement known as the Reform. This movement broke away from traditional systems, brought about greater democracy, decentralization and a greater degree of diversity in the groups responsible for control and policy-making, introduced panels of teachers, graduates and students which were jointly responsible for the government of the university community.

The reformist movement started in the University of Cordoba, Argentina, in June 1918, with the famous "Manifesto of the Argentine youth of Cordoba to the free men of South America" a body of doctrine which was

adopted by all of Latin America. University autonomy, and a greater degree of democracy in its management, were the main tenets of the new doctrine. Institutional autonomy, and the fact that the institution itself is run by a tripartite system, are characteristic of the pattern of management that has since emerged in the area and which is reflected in prevailing legislation.

The system provides for a hierarchy of policy-making, controlling and administrative bodies, with inter-relations of great complexity.

Although these three panels coexist as a general rule, there are nevertheless some differences. The tripartite arrangement may apply either to all the parts of a given system, or only to some of its organisms and at given levels. There are other exceptions, such as non-representation of the graduates, for instance. In Argentina, joint management has been achieved at all levels and for all bodies, both in the Assembly and in the Higher Council of Universities, in the Boards and all other bodies at lower echelons. In no body of the Universities of Ecuador, Chile and Bolivia are graduates included; in Paraguay they belong only to the Council of the University; and in Costa Rica they are members of the Assemblies but not of the Councils. Participation by the alumni themselves also follows different patterns. In Colombia they take part in the work of the Assemblies and Higher Councils of the Faculties but not in that of the Council of the University (Consejo Academico); in Costa Rica they belong to the University and Faculty Assemblies, but not to the Councils; while in Chile they belong only to the Faculty Councils.

The proportion of student and graduate representation, in relation to the whole, also varies. Graduates and students may be in equal numbers, as in a number of universities in Argentina and Uruguay, or there may be fewer of the former than of the latter. The number of students may equal that of the teachers, as is the case in Bolivia —where graduates are not represented. They can account for one third of the membership as is the case in the Board and Higher Council of the Faculties of Ecuador and the Higher Council of Faculties in Peru, or they can be represented by a single member in the Higher Councils of the Faculties as is the case in Ecuador or Paraguay. In most cases, the panel of professors holds a majority of the votes.

The extent of their participation in actual management may also vary to a large degree. The group of graduates may be devoid of voting rights, as is the case in Peru and the same may be true of student representation, although this constitutes an exception. In the University of Chile, students have voting rights in the Council of Faculties when questions are dealt with which are of direct concern to them.

The bodies and entities jointly responsible for the management of universities are, in most cases, the following:

i) *The "Assembly", "Claustro Pleno", "Conciliatura" or University Board.*

This is the highest decision-making body for the most fundamental questions in university policy. Its main functions are the following: election of the Rector, approval of the Statutes, creation of Faculties or the opening of new courses; and in certain cases it approves the budget and acts as an Appeals Tribunal. Its membership, in the majority of universities, includes the Rector, the Vice-Rector, the Deans, the members of the Higher Council of the Faculties or their representatives.

According to present practice, the Assembly is not included among the governing bodies when, as is the case in Paraguay and Chile, the Rector is appointed by the President of the Republic.

ii) *The Higher Councils, University Councils or Academic Councils.*

They have administrative and executive powers to carry out university policies. Their main area of responsibility is as follows: to confer degrees, to approve programmes for courses, regulations and ordinances, to decide all questions relating to teaching and research, the management of resources, and, if need be, to act as a higher tribunal.

As a general rule, these Councils include among their membership the Rector, the Vice-Rector and the Deans of the Faculties, and representatives of the professors, the graduates and the students. In Chile, Paraguay, Ecuador, Venezuela and Nicaragua the Minister of Education or his deputy sit on these councils.

iii) *The Faculty Assemblies, Boards, or "Claustros".*

They occur only in certain patterns of university management, such as prevails in Ecuador, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Brazil. Their role vis-à-vis the faculties is similar to that played by the Assembly in the university as a whole. That is to say, to elect the Dean and the Vice-Dean, and in certain cases to approve the budget and the ordinances and regulations in as much as they are intended to apply to the faculty itself. Normally, the whole body of professors belongs to it, with students and graduates in varying proportions. In Venezuela, students constitute 25% of the Assembly as a whole, as against only five graduates. In Ecuador, student representation accounts for one third of the membership.

iv) *The Executive Council or Faculty Council.*

This is an organism responsible, at faculty level, for all matters pertaining to administration and teaching. In all of the region and with very few exceptions, it is the Executive Council which gives the university its own particular stamp. Its decisions have a very direct bearing on the type and level of achievements of a given university. Its membership is usually as follows: the Dean, the Vice-Dean and the Professors on the one hand and on the other the representatives of the students, and also, in certain cases, of the graduates.

v) *"Patronato", Board of Trustees (non-academic).*

These do not occur very frequently in the Latin American system of university management. They exist however in Mexico, Peru and Brazil, and carry out day-to-day tasks in assistance and administration, particularly in economic affairs.

The pattern just described applies to national, or government-run, universities. Private universities, which are Catholic in nearly all cases, are run along traditional systems of management.

Election of authorities and representatives.

Most of the prevailing legislation establishes the right of a university to elect its authorities freely without interference from outside.

Rectors are elected by the University Assembly. Vice-Rectors may be elected either by the Assembly or by the Higher Council of the university. Deans and Vice-Deans are elected in the Faculty Assemblies or

Boards, whenever such institutions exist, or directly by the Executive Councils of the faculties. There are nevertheless some exceptions, as we have already noted—in Chile, Brazil and Paraguay, the Rector is appointed by the President of the Republic, following the university's proposals. In Chile, the Deans are also appointed by the President according to the same procedure. In Paraguay, the Deans are appointed by the Rector.

The representatives of graduates, students and professors are elected by their peers, except in Chile, where the appointment of professors to sit on the councils has to be approved by the President of the Republic.

In certain cases, regulations lay down the conditions which have to be fulfilled by would-be representatives. So far as professors are concerned, the category to which they should belong—titular, associate—is stipulated. So far as graduates are concerned, it is sometimes stipulated that they should not belong to the body of teachers of the university, and that representation is not individual, but through a College of Graduates. Students, too, may sometimes have requirements to meet, that they should be in the terminal years of their course, or that they should belong to a given organization or group of students.

The Rectors, Vice-Rectors, Deans and Vice-Deans, and the members of the various groups responsible for university management, hold mandates of varying lengths. Mandates on the governing councils are of 3, 4 or 5 years for the Rectors, Vice-Rectors, Deans, Vice-Deans and professors. Representatives of the students and graduates are replaced at shorter intervals.

In some universities in Argentina, students hold a one-year mandate while the term of office for graduates is three years, and four years for the professors, Deans, Vice-Deans, Rectors, and Vice-Rectors. Those in office may be re-elected, in certain cases, without limitation, while in others eligibility for re-election is restricted—for instance, that two terms of office should not be served consecutively or that there should be no more than two.

Continuity in management is provided, in the different systems, by the procedure which provides that the terms of office should be of differing lengths. Thus in Ecuador and Paraguay, the term of office for Rectors is five years; the term of office of the Deans is three.

Over the last few years, a number of inter-university organizations have become active in the different countries. While their functions do not fall specifically within the frame of university management, they are responsible for the co-ordination and/or planning of university education. In Argentina and Peru there is an Inter-university Council, in Bolivia the Congress of Universities and the Conference of Rectors, in Mexico the National Association of Universities and Institutes of Higher Learning, in Colombia the Colombian Association of Rectors and the Forum Universitario in Brazil.

Of all these organizations, the Higher Council of the Universities of Central America has probably the widest scope—it plans and co-ordinates university education in five countries: Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua.

B. *Relations of Universities and Governments.*

The whole matter of the autonomy of the university vis-à-vis the government is a very great cause for pre-occupation, and a considerable bone of contention, in Latin American universities. Institutional autonomy and everything that it involves—a free choice, by election, of its

executive officers, freedom in the appointment of teachers, curriculum requirements which have to be met for academic and professional degrees and titles to be conferred, the planning of research and liberty to handle financial resources is very often violated, in spite of the existence of laws, decrees and other legal standards which claim, at least in theory, to uphold this principle. Autonomy is more generally construed as academic freedom, or freedom of teaching, than in the full institutional sense of the term.

Against a backdrop of constant political instability, the frequency with which the institutional order of things is disrupted and government taken over by force, is such that this particular segment of social life—the University—is constantly in the forefront of our preoccupations, gives rise to many tensions, is engaged in a constant re-appraisal of its own problems, and is a constant invitation to open militancy, especially in youth.

The population of Latin American nations is predominantly young. Students tend to assume responsibilities in social leadership almost as soon as they have completed their courses. Students—as potential leaders of the community—are very keenly aware of their commitment and tend to voice their concern and express their preoccupation even within the university. Governments—in particular the "strong"—do not and cannot countenance such a situation. In many cases, in order to silence the voice of the students and induce them to behave more quietly, a number of stringent measures are taken by which university autonomy is brought to heel. Channels of communication between the universities and the government are thus interrupted, and relations become difficult to resume, since even when the situation has become more normal, traces remain of profound resentment and justified mistrust. Dialogue and co-operation between the universities and the government are neither frequent nor easy.

Formally, the institutional link between the two is provided, in certain countries, by Departments or Divisions of Higher Education within the Ministry of Education. To quote but a few, there is the National Technical Council for Higher Education in Ecuador, the National Council of Universities in Venezuela, the Division of Higher Education and Teacher Training in Colombia. Vis-à-vis the universities of the country, these ministerial departments may exercize administrative controls, as in Colombia or ensure compliance with prevailing legislation, as in Brazil.

In certain cases the link between the government and the university is provided by the fact that the Minister of Education or his deputy sits on the Higher Council of the university, as is the case in Chile—and also in Ecuador, Paraguay and Venezuela. In other cases, such as in Costa Rica and Nicaragua, Ministers or their representatives sit on the Board or Assemblies. In Brazil they are represented on the Administrative Council. The links between the university and the central government have been explained—in Mexico such bonds exist between the universities and the various federated states, where many of them control the universities under their jurisdiction.

At all events the most frequent arrangement is one whereby the departments in the Ministries of the central government are essentially responsible for questions relating to private universities: to give them official recognition, to approve their statutes and curricula, supervise their activities, and last but not least to confer professional grades and qualifications.

In passing, the fact that in a number of countries the only institutions qualified to confer degrees are national universities should be mentioned.

In spite of its autonomy, the university is always considered to be the

"third level" of education and part and parcel of the system of public education. In general terms, however, it cannot be said that there is a satisfactory correlation between secondary and university education. The link is of a formal nature, and is provided by the fact that for entrance into the universities a number of certificates, or qualifications, conferred by middle-level schools, are required and accepted. And also by the fact that diplomas awarded by the universities qualify graduate teachers for the secondary level.

C. *The Selection, Appointment, Promotion and Legal Protection of Academic Staff.*

The hierarchy of university teachers is that of the usual categories: titular, associate, etc. There are also, frequently, honorary professors, emeritus professors, and "consultos". Apart from these categories, which are those of the university's established staff, some teachers are recruited on a non-permanent contract basis.

Private education is another widespread characteristic. It is interesting to underline here that one of the principles of the Reform movement in the universities was the support of this form of teaching, which makes it possible to establish courses parallel to those of the public institutions.

In spite of strenuous efforts to convince teachers to give more, or all, of their time to teaching, in spite also of the fact that many university statutes explicitly recognize the three categories—full-time, part-time and occasional—for the majority of professors teaching is still a part-time activity. This question is of great importance when considered as the key to higher efficiency and greater concentration in teaching, and to the development of scientific research. In most public universities, appointments to the academic staff are made on a competitive basis. Professors appointed on this basis hold office for three to ten years. Once the term of office is over the process is renewed and professors who wish to have their appointment extended must sit for another examination and in certain cases their performance as teachers has to be assessed.

At all events, appointment is for a definite period although it may be renewed. Referring again to the Reform movement, it upheld both the principle of appointments for a definite period, and the system of examinations described above.

In private universities, the appointment of teachers is usually done directly, and is not subject to any limitation in time.

In some countries of the region, the teachers' career is subjected to laws and regulations embodying criteria which have to be met for promotion to a higher category. In Argentina, in the University of Buenos Aires, the career of auxiliary teachers has also been submitted to certain regulations, and machinery established to confer the various grades, up to the level of "Jefe de Trabajos Practicos", and culmating in the "Venia Docendi" which gives the necessary credits to claim entrance to the first level, the professorial status.

There are also widely applied systems for pension and retirement and the legal protection of the profession.

D. *Financial and Budgetary Matters.*

The bulk of the official universities' resources is provided by the national budget. In certain cases, the amount of the appropriation is laid down by law, as a percentage of the national budget or the gross national product.

As the need arises, income may be added from special taxes, or supplementary appropriations. Universities may increase their resources by incorporating income from their own holdings, fees for services to third parties, for advice, income from the sale of products, etc. Student fees when they exist, are virtually negligible, and have no bearing on the overall amount of resources available to the University. Although infrequently, the universities also receive grants and gifts. They are entitled, by law, to distribute their income, and have their budget set out and approved at a given level of their own administration and management. It is only in exceptional cases that the budget has to be approved at government level, as in Ecuador and Paraguay. Private universities are financially self-supporting. They are nevertheless assisted by the State in certain countries, as in Brazil or Paraguay. In Chile, state assistance accounts for 50% of their budget. In Argentina, on the contrary, it is prohibited by law to appropriate government funds for private universities.

Translated from the Russian.

SOVIET UNION

I.T. Shvets

Rector, Kiev State University

(The data presented below take account of the basic common characteristics of Soviet universities, even though more specific reference is made to the University of Kiev.)

The universities of the Soviet Union come under the authority of the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the U.S.S.R., but in matters of finance and material organization, they depend directly on the competent ministry of the Union Republic in which they are situated.

The Kiev State University, like all others, has a constitution that provides for a central administration (the Rectorate), for faculties, research institutes, departments, laboratories and a series of other divisions and services. The Kiev University has the following 17 faculties: biology; geography; journalism; history; philosophy; mathematics and mechanics; physics; radio-physics; philology; foreign languages; chemistry; law and economics; a preparatory faculty for foreign students, and two for general sciences.

The professors and other teaching staff are distributed among the different departments, of which there are 117.

The following research establishments are in operation at the University: an institute of human and animal physiology; a common computation centre; an astronomical observatory; an experimental biological research station; a bio-geographic park (at Kanevo); a film studio; a botanical garden; a scientific research centre; a division for scientific methodology; an institute for programmed teaching aids, and a series of specialized laboratories. The Universities of Moscow and Kiev both have institutes providing advanced training for teachers in the social sciences.

It is to be noted that the University of Moscow, in particular, includes a large number of major research institutes of the highest level in which some of the most eminent scholars of the country work.

In administrative terms, the universities have a number of divisions under the direction of the Rector assisted by his Pro-Rectors: teaching;

research; administration and financial management. In addition there are various offices; a section for personnel; a central office of accounts; archives, and a number of other services.

The direction and management of the universities are carried out in accordance with model constitutional patterns that apply to all institutions of higher education. Within these patterns, the particular constitution of each university is worked out by the Rectorate, and ratified by the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education. The Rector, who heads the university, is proposed by the professorial staff from among eminent scholars, and appointed by the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education. He has three to five assistants (the Pro-Rectors), whom he proposes for appointment and who are appointed by the Ministry. In conformity with the principle of a single directing authority, the Rector directs all the activities of the university and is its representative; he is completely responsible for the administration of the university to the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, and directs all the affairs of the university in the fields of teaching, research, cultural activities, political training and financial management.

Assisted by Pro-Rectors respectively responsible for teaching; research; administration and financial management; correspondence and evening courses, and foreign students, the Rector discharges his duties through the relevant divisions and sections and, in addition, through consultative organs of the university.

Questions of instruction and teaching methods come under the competence of the Pro-Rector in charge of teaching and the division for teaching, which is responsible for the organization of all full-time instruction. It comprises a chief of division, an assistant head, senior and assistant methodologists (i.e. specialists in the methodology of teaching) and inspectors.

The division for research plans research; controls its execution; organizes scientific meetings and conferences; directs the education of future graduates and doctoral students; co-ordinates the use of the facilities of various departments and laboratories; organizes scientific expeditions; and promotes the use in production of the results and discoveries of research. The direction of the division is the responsibility of the Pro-Rector for research, helped by the Assistant Pro-Rector for the "aspirantura" (1) and an inspector of theses.

The Pro-Rector for correspondence and evening courses is responsible for the overall conduct of these forms of education. The section under his care includes an Assistant Pro-Rector and a number of "methodologists".

The "foreign" section directs the studies of foreign students, "aspirantura" candidates and trainees; maintains relations with university and scientific institutions abroad; organizes visits abroad for university staff and receives foreign academics coming to give lectures, to exchange experience or to pursue higher scientific studies. The Pro-Rector for foreign students heads this section. The preparatory faculty for foreign students and the section for foreign relations both operate under his direction.

The division for administration and financial management is responsible for economic services and those that are concerned with both the material and cultural life of the institution, with building, with recurrent repairs as well as those requiring capital expenditure. It is also charged

(1) Advanced studies leading to the degree of "Candidat" of the Sciences.

with looking after the maintenance of good conditions, health and sanitation in the university buildings and grounds, as well as furnishing equipment and other supplies to departments, laboratories and research centres and various other divisions.

Under the direction of the Pro-Rector for administration and financial management, the division includes three sections: one for senior personnel, administrative offices, postal services and archives; one for building operations; and one for equipment and supplies.

In addition, the following organs also participate in the administration of the university: the University Council for General Questions; the Council for the Award of Academic Degrees; the Council for Methodology; the Rectorate.

The first reviews annual and semestrial working plans; the reports of faculties, institutes, departments and laboratories; dossiers on appointments (made on a competitive basis) of departmental heads and professors; awards the titles of professor, "docent" and "scientific assistant"; and guides and controls the work of the faculty councils. The Council is composed of the Pro-Rectors, deans of faculties, directors of institutes, heads of departments, heads of laboratories and representatives of social organizations. It is chaired by the Rector.

The Rector also chairs the Council for the Award of Academic Degrees, which confers the degree of "Candidat" of the Sciences on persons who have successfully defended their theses before faculty councils, and accepts doctoral theses for defence. However, its decisions on doctorates are subject to approval by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the U.S.S.R.

The Council for Methodology reviews questions relating to the improvement of the quality of teaching and instructional methods, and also those concerning the organization and methods of training scientific and teaching staff. It comprises the following sections: general questions of method (improvement of teaching); production of textbooks, practical handbooks and other educational materials; educational films; practical training in teaching or production and relationships with schools; correspondence and evening courses. Composed of experienced teachers as members, the Council is chaired by the Pro-Rector in charge of teaching.

The Rectorate maintains a review of current affairs of university administration, faculties, institutes, departments, laboratories and other establishments. In addition to the Pro-Rectors, participants in meetings of the Rectorate include deans of faculties, directors of institutes and other structural sub-divisions of the university, non-faculty departmental heads and representatives of social organizations.

The Rector chairs the Admissions Commission, which controls the admission of students to the university, and the State Commission in charge of the distribution and placement of young graduates. He directs the work of faculty deans, the directors of institutes and the other scientific establishments of the university.

Together with the social organizations, the Rector supervises the educational activities of the student body, the professorial and teaching staff, and auxiliary instructional staff.

The faculty is an administrative, teaching and research sub-division of the university which, on one hand, provides for the education of students and "aspirants" in some subject or a group of connected specialities and, on the other, the direction of departmental research. The faculty groups,

the various corresponding departments, laboratories, sections and facilities serving teaching and research.

Each faculty has two councils: one for general questions, the other for the award of qualifications.

The faculty is headed by a dean who is elected by the faculty council (general) by secret ballot for a period of three years.

The department forms the basic structural subdivision of the faculty. It is responsible for teaching, instructional methods and research in one discipline or group of related disciplines, and also for the socio-political education of students, as well as the training or upgrading of teaching and scientific staff.

The department has a staff of professors, "docents", "senior assistants", senior lecturers, lecturers, senior and junior research workers and "aspirants". Heading the department is the professor holding a titular chair.

The relationships of the Kiev State University with the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the U.S.S.R. and with the similarly named Ministry of the Ukrainian Republic are founded, on one hand, on the principle of autonomy and, on the other, of dependence in matters of finance, overall co-ordination of research and methods of education.

The Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the U.S.S.R. provides for the administration of these two levels of education applicable throughout the country and oversees all institutions of higher education with regard to programmes and methods of instruction and research.

The Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the Ukrainian Republic finances the university and provides general guidance on its educational functions.

Within its constitutional limits, the university carries out its tasks independently.

The relationships of the university with state, social, industrial and cultural institutions are founded on the equality of rights and of autonomy.

All maintenance costs of the university are covered by funds allocated through the Republic's budget.

The Kiev State University draft budget itself is drawn up annually by the Rector and ratified by the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the Ukrainian Republic. The amount of the financial allocation is fixed in accordance with established norms, taking account of the number of students in each branch of higher education and of "aspirants", the number of departments and research institutes, and of the university's development plans (new buildings, etc.).

The finances made available for teaching, research and the acquisition of educational and research supplies are distributed by the Rector between the faculties and independent departments, following review by a meeting of the Rectorate.

Within the limits of finances available to their respective faculties and departments, deans and heads of departments decide upon their use and carry full responsibility for their complete and proper utilization.

The allocation of funds on the basis of the draft budget submitted by the university is effected by the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the Ukrainian Republic through the Republic's Ministry of Finance.

Apart from the financial allocation made in the Republic's budget, certain other special expenditures are covered supplementarily through special funds (maintenance costs of student residences, transportation, certain preparatory courses etc.).

The research sector occupies an important position with regard to the special funds, because in it some research work is carried out on contract between the university and different economic agencies or services.

At the Kiev State University, as in other universities, the professorial and teaching staff comprises the following hierarchy: heads of department who are titular professors, professors, "docents", assistants, senior teachers and teachers.

Recruitment to fill vacancies for heads of departments, professors, "docents", assistants, senior teachers and teachers is made on a competitive basis.

Regulations for the organization of competitive selection are defined in the special directives included in a regulation established by the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education in accord with the Central Pan-Union Council of Trade Unions.

Appointments to the professorial and teaching staffs of universities made through the competitive process are tenable for a period of five years.

The decisions of the commission for selection and the university councils are submitted for ratification to the Rector.

In certain special cases, the appointment of assistants or teachers may be made without competitive selection on the decision of the Rector. The Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education may recommend such persons for these posts as have already completed their "aspirantura", or a training period as an assistant, or a period of teaching in a higher education establishment, or simply requirements for a first university diploma or degree.

In these cases, those concerned must, after three years, present themselves for re-appointment to the posts they occupy, provided that the university council has not already found the teacher unfit for the requirements of his work. In such a case, the Rector terminates his appointment, and opens the post to competitive selection even before the end of the three-year term.

A competitive selection may be held at any time of the year.

Announcements of such competitions are made in the periodical press with detailed information on requirements.

Candidates for selection must be Soviet citizens who have the requisite higher education diploma, degree or title.

To review applications of candidates, selection commissions at the university and faculty level are elected by secret ballot by the councils of the university and its faculties. These commissions also include members representing student organizations.

The councils take their decisions in open sessions, and anyone—including the candidates—may participate in these.

A final council decision on selection requires that at least two-thirds of the regular members of the council schould be present for the review of candidates, and that the candidate should get more than 50 per cent of the votes of the council members present.

The results of such selective recruitment for all professorial and teaching staff appointments are submitted to the Rector for ratification.

The appointments so confirmed after selection are tenable for five

years; at the end of this period, members of the professorial and teaching staff must present themselves for re-appointment, which requires that they should be re-elected for a new period by the university council voting by secret ballot.

The results of the selection procedure or the re-elections are open to appeal before the Rector or the professional union, within a delay of no more than ten days after the council has given its decision.

A professional union has the right to request the Rector to declare an appointment or re-election null and void in cases where there has been any irregularity of procedure.

Professorial and teaching staff participation in the selection and re-election procedures entail precise juridical consequences.

Highly qualified specialists from industry or research institutions who do not have academic degrees or titles may, if chosen through competitive selection and confirmed by the Rector, be appointed to function as departmental heads, professors or "docents". They then receive the same salary as they did during the year preceding their appointment, provided this does not exceed the regular salary of a "docent". The establishment of this special law takes account of the interests of both the university and those recruited from industry.

Teachers participating in the competitive selection of another institution of higher education retain their former post until the end of the academic year. Furthermore, if physical incapacity obliges a teacher to give up his post, and he needs financial assistance, he retains the same rights of State social security aid as if he had never had to interrupt his work.

In a case where, as a result of competitive selection, a teacher is promoted to a higher post at the same university, his relationship with it is subject to modification with regard to labour legislation: there is a revision of the scope of his tasks, his salary, etc.

Teachers may voluntarily relinquish their posts, provided that they give at least two weeks' notice to the administration.

In case of retrenchment of staff or of university undertakings, legislation in force allows for the dismissal of a teacher recruited by selection or re-election at the end of the year, and in agreement with the local committee of the professional union.

The competitive nature of the selection and election of staff strengthens the teacher's sense of responsibility toward the quality of his research work, teaching and education; it stimulates endeavours to improve his teaching and academic qualifications; it favours the advancement of young teachers of talent, and permits the recruitment of highly qualified specialists for educational activities from research institutes, industry and other branches of the economy and national culture.

In conclusion, the following points may be noted:

1. The tasks of higher education and the interests of the university are conceived in an identical manner by the university itself, on one hand, and the Government of the Soviet Union, on the other. It is precisely this conjunction of the interests of the higher education establishments and the State that forms the highest expression of the Soviet university's autonomy.

2. The Government of the Soviet Union provides fully for the material and financial needs of the universities and contributes toward their development through all means at its disposal.

3. The State itself undertakes to supply graduates with work corres-

ponding to their qualifications and resolves all problems involved in their placement.

4. The Soviet universities enjoy full autonomy in matters concerning the selection of teaching staff, the award of degrees and titles, the administration of entrance examinations, the organization and execution of their tasks of teaching, research and education. In the constructive implementation of these functions, they also learn from the positive experience of other institutions of higher education in the Soviet Union and abroad.

The new progress that is now characterizing Soviet higher education opens great new perspectives for its universities.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

6, RUE FRANKLIN, PARIS XVI

PERIODICAL

* *Bulletin of the International Association of Universities.*
Since 1953. Quarterly: February, May, August, and November.

REFERENCE WORKS

International Handbook of Universities
Third edition, 1965, XI + 1031 pages.

World List: Universities, Other Institutions of Higher Education, University Organizations. 1967.
Eighth edition, 1967, XVII + 450 pages.

Collection of Agreements Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications.
1966, VII + 655 pages (reprint).

Documents Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications.
1957. 280 leaves.

PAPERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

1. *Three Aspects of University Development To-Day.* 1953. 46 pages.
2. *Health at the University.* 1954. 76 pages.
3. *Student Mental Health.* 1958. 76 pages.
4. * *University Education and Public Service.* 1959. 1[illegible] pages.
5. * *The Interplay of Scientific and Cultural Values in Higher Education Today.* 1960. 81 pages.
6. * *The Expansion of Higher Education.* 1960. 117 pages.
7. *University Autonomy—Its Meaning To-Day.* 1965. 139 pages.

STUDIES AND REPORTS

The Staffing of Higher Education.
1960. 169 pages.

Some Economic Aspects of Educational Development in Europe.
1961. 144 pages.

Formal Programmes of International Co-operation between University Institutions.
1960. 39 pages in-4° (published by Unesco).

Report of a Meeting of Heads of African Institutions of Higher Education, Khartoum, 16-19 September, 1963.
1964. 107 pages.

* *Report of the International Conference of Universities, Nice, December, 1950.*
1951. 162 pages.

Report of Proceedings, Second General Conference of International Association of Universities, Istanbul, September, 1955.
1956. 232 pages.

Report of Proceedings, Third General Conference of International Association of Universities, Mexico, September, 1960.
1961. 224 pages.

Report of the Fourth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Tokyo, 31 August-6 September, 1965. 1966. 264 pages.

Administrative Reports of International Association of Universities: 1951-1954.
1955. 40 pages.

Idem: 1955-1959. 1960. 58 pages.

Idem: 1960-1964. 1965. 129 pages.

JOINT UNESCO-IAU RESEARCH PROGRAMME IN HIGHER EDUCATION (1)

The International Study of University Admissions:

Vol. I: *Access to Higher Education*, by Frank Bowles. 1963. 212 pages.

Vol. II: *National Studies.* 1965. 648 pages.

Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia. Summary Report.
1965. 94 pages.

Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia:

Vol. I: *Director's Report*, by Howard Hayden. 1967. 508 pages.

Vol. II: *Country Profiles.* 615 pages.

Vol. III: part 1. *High-level manpower for development*, by Guy Hunter. 1967.
part 2. *Language policy and higher education*, by Richard Noss. 1967.

* Published with the financial assistance of Unesco.

(1) Reports issued under this Programme are produced jointly by Unesco and IAU and may be purchased through national distributors of Unesco publications.